BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

PURCHASED WITH THE INCOME OF THE FUND
GIVEN BY

FREDERICK MADGE
1820-1908

SON OF THE REV. THOS. MADGE, 1786-1870, OF
ESSEX STREET CHAPEL, LONDON, 1825-1859

Street

Library

F 173

Locke John, An essay on Enthusiasm

Manning James, Church Reform

Review of Dr. J. P. Smith's Scripture testimony of the Messiah

Shepherd Revd. Dr., The insufficiency of the Ecclesiastical Establishment of India

Wallace Revd. Robt, A plain Statement & Scriptural defence of the leading doctrines of Unitarianism

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/essayonenthusias00lock

AN

ESSAY

ON

ENTHUSIASM,

BY

JOHN LOCKE,

BEING

THE NINETEENTH CHAPTER OF THE FOURTH BOOK OF HIS ESSAY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING.

"Why *even of yourselves* judge ye not what is right?" *Jesus Christ.*

"Believe not every spirit, but *try the spirits* whether *they are of* GOD." *John the Evangelist.*

"I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say." *Paul.*

Property of
CBSK
Please return to
Graduate Theolog.
Union Library

LONDON:
Printed by Stower & Smallfield, Hackney;
AND SOLD BY R. HUNTER, (SUCCESSOR TO J. JOHNSON)
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD.

1815.

B
1292
E87
1815

B787.3
L793

TO THE

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,

THIS

EDITION OF LOCKE'S ESSAY

ON

ENTHUSIASM,

IS

RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY

THEIR SINCERE WELL-WISHER

IN THE

TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS,

THE

EDITOR.

1 Jn 08 Higher

5515

The following Works by THOMAS FOSTER, *are sold by* R. HUNTER, *(Successor to J. Johnson), St. Paul's Church-yard.*

1. A VINDICATION OF SCRIPTURAL UNITARIANISM, and some other Primitive Christian Doctrines, in reply to Vindex's Examination of an Appeal to the Society of Friends. By Thomas Foster, under the Signature of Verax. 8vo. pp. 124. Price 3s.
2. A NARRATIVE OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN AMERICA, of the Society called Quakers, in the Case of Hannah Barnard, to which is prefixed, A Brief Review of the previous Transactions in Great Britain and Ireland. Price 4s.
3. CHRISTIAN UNITARIANISM VINDICATED, being a Reply to a Work by John Bevans, jun. entitled A Defence of the Christian Doctrines of the Society of Friends. 8vo. pp. 324. Price 7s. in Boards.
4. A NARRATIVE OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY CALLED QUAKERS, within the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex, against Thomas Foster, for openly professing their Primitive Doctrines concerning the Unity of God. 8vo. pp. 372. Pref. pp. xl. Index pp. 16. Price 10s. in Boards.
5. AN APPEAL AND ADDRESS TO THE YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS, held in London, A. D. 1814. By Thomas Foster, on his Excommunication, for asserting the Unity and Supremacy of God the Father. Price 4s. in Boards.

Of whom also may be had,

6. REMARKS ON THE YEARLY MEETING EPISTLE, of the People called Quakers, for the Year 1810. From the Monthly Repository. By An Unitarian Christian, Breviloquus, Pacificus and Candidus. 8vo. Price 6d.
7. DEVOTIONAL AND DOCTRINAL EXTRACTS, FROM EPISTLES OF THE YEARLY MEETINGS IN LONDON, of the People called Quakers, from the Year 1678 to 1810. London: Printed for Cradock and Joy, Paternoster Row.
8. THE SANDY FOUNDATION SHAKEN; or those so generally received Doctrines of one God, subsisting in three distinct and separate Persons, the Impossibility of God's pardoning Sinners, without a plenary Satisfaction, the Justification of impure Persons by an imputative Righteousness, Refuted, from the Authority of Scripture Testimonies and right Reason. By William Penn, a Builder on that Foundation which cannot be moved. 8vo. Price 1s.
9. The same Work, in 12mo. Price 4d.
10. "THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY AS DELIVERED IN THE SCRIPTURES," by John Locke, last Edit. p. 147. Price in boards, 3s. 6d, including a short account of the Life and Writings of the Author, with his celebrated "Essay for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, by consulting St. Paul himself."

AN

ESSAY ON ENTHUSIASM.

Sect. 1. *Love of Truth necessary.*

HE that would seriously set upon the search of truth, ought in the first place to prepare his mind with a love of it: for he that loves it not, will not take much pains to get it, nor be much concerned when he misses it. There is nobody in the commonwealth of learning, who does not profess himself a lover of truth: and there is not a rational creature that would not take it amiss to be thought otherwise of. And yet, for all this, one may truly say, there are very few lovers of truth for truth's sake, even amongst those who persuade themselves that they are so. How a man may know whether he be so in earnest, is worth inquiry: and I think there is this one unerring mark of it, *viz.* the not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance, than the proofs it is built upon will warrant. Whoever goes beyond this measure of assent, it is plain, receives not truth in the love of it; loves not truth for truth's sake, but for some other by-end. For the evidence that any proposition is true, (except such as are self-evident), lying only in the proofs a man has of it, whatsoever degrees of assent he affords it beyond the degrees of that evidence, it is plain all that surplusage of assurance is owing to some other affection, and not to the love of truth: it being as impossible, that the love of truth should carry my assent above the evidence there is to me, that it is true, as that the love of truth should make me assent to any proposition, for the sake of that evidence, which it has not, that it is true; which is, in effect, to love it as a truth, be-

cause it is possible or probable that it may not be true. In any truth that gets not possession of our minds by the irresistible light of self-evidence, or by the force of demonstration, the arguments that gain it assent, are the vouchers and gage of its probability to us; and we can receive it for no other than such as they deliver it to our understandings. Whatsoever credit or authority we give to any proposition more than it receives from the principles and proofs it supports itself upon, is owing to our inclinations that way, and is so far a derogation from the love of truth, as such: which, as it can receive no evidence from our passions or interests, so it should receive no tincture from them.

Sect. 2. A Forwardness to dictate, from whence.

The assuming an authority of dictating to others, and a forwardness to prescribe to their opinions, is a constant concomitant of this bias and corruption of our judgments: for how almost can it be otherwise, but that he should be ready to impose on others' belief, who has already imposed on his own? Who can reasonably expect arguments and conviction from him, in dealing with others, whose understanding is not accustomed to them in his dealing with himself? Who does violence to his own faculties, tyrannizes over his own mind, and usurps the prerogative that belongs to truth alone, which is to command assent by only its own authority, *i. e.* by and in proportion to that evidence which it carries with it.

Sect. 3. Force of Enthusiasm.

Upon this occasion I shall take the liberty to consider a third ground of assent, which, with some men, has the same authority, and is as confidently relied on as either faith or reason: I mean enthusiasm; which, laying by reason, would set up revelation without it. Whereby, in effect, it takes away both

reason and revelation, and substitutes in the room of it the ungrounded fancies of a man's own brain, and assumes them for a foundation both of opinion and conduct.

Sect. 4. *Reason and Revelation.*

Reason is natural revelation, whereby the eternal Father of light, and fountain of all knowledge, communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties: revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by GOD immediately, which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives, that they come from GOD. So that he that takes away reason, to make way for revelation, puts out the light of both, and does much the same, as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope.

Sect. 5. *Rise of Enthusiasm.*

Immediate revelation being a much easier way for men to establish their opinions, and regulate their conduct, than the tedious and not always successful labour of strict reasoning, it is no wonder that some have been very apt to pretend to revelation, and to persuade themselves that they are under the peculiar guidance of heaven in their actions and opinions, especially in those of them which they cannot account for by the ordinary methods of knowledge, and principles of reason. Hence we see, that, in all ages, men, in whom melancholy has mixed with devotion, or whose conceit of themselves has raised them into an opinion of a greater familiarity with GOD, and a nearer admittance to his favour, than is afforded to others, have often flattered themselves with a persuasion of an immediate intercourse with the Deity, and frequent communications from the Divine Spirit.

God, I own, cannot be denied to be able to enlighten the understanding by a ray darted into the mind immediately from the fountain of light. This they understand, he has promised to do; and who then has so good a title to expect it, as those who are his peculiar people, chosen by him, and depending on him?

Sect. 6. *Enthusiasm.*

Their minds being thus prepared, whatever groundless opinion comes to settle itself strongly upon their fancies, is an illumination from the Spirit of God, and presently of divine authority; and whatsoever odd action they find in themselves a strong inclination to do, that impulse is concluded to be a call or direction from heaven, and must be obeyed; it is a commission from above, and they cannot err in executing it.

§ 7. This I take to be properly enthusiasm, which, though founded neither on reason nor divine revelation, but rising from the conceits of a warmed or overweening brain, works yet, where it once gets footing, more powerfully on the persuasions and actions of men, than either of those two, or both together: men being most forwardly obedient to the impulses they receive from themselves; and the whole man is sure to act more vigorously, where the whole man is carried by a natural motion. For strong conceit, like a new principle, carries all easily with it, when got above common sense, and freed from all restraint of reason and check of reflection, it is heightened into a divine authority, in concurrence with our own temper and inclination.

Sect. 8. *Enthusiasm mistaken for Seeing and Feeling.*

Though the odd opinions and extravagant actions enthusiasm has run men into, were enough to warn them against this wrong principle, so apt to misguide them both in their belief and conduct; yet the love

of something extraordinary, the ease and glory it is to be inspired, and be above the common and natural ways of knowledge, so flatters many men's laziness, ignorance and vanity, that when once they are got into this way of immediate revelation, of illumination without search, and of certainty without proof, and without examination, it is a hard matter to get them out of it. Reason is lost upon them; they are above it: they see the light infused into their understandings, and cannot be mistaken; it is clear and visible there, like the light of bright sunshine; shews itself, and needs no other proof, but its own evidence; they feel the hand of GOD moving them within, and the impulses of the spirit, and cannot be mistaken in what they feel. Thus they support themselves, and are sure reason hath nothing to do with what they see and feel in themselves; what they have a sensible experience of, admits no doubt, needs no probation. Would he not be ridiculous who should require to have it proved to him, that the light shines, and that he sees it? It is its own proof, and can have no other. When the Spirit brings light into our minds, it dispels darkness. We see it, as we do that of the sun at noon, and need not the twilight of reason to shew it us. This light from heaven is strong, clear and pure; carries its own demonstration with it; and we may as rationally take a glow-worm to assist us to discover the sun, as to examine the celestial ray by our dim candle, reason.

§ 9. This is the way of talking of these men: they are sure, because they are sure; and their persuasions are right, only because they are strong in them. For, when what they say is stripped of the metaphor of seeing and feeling, this is all it amounts to; and yet these similes so impose on them, that they serve them for certainty in themselves, and demonstration to others.

Sect. 10. *Enthusiasm, how to be discovered.*

But to examine a little soberly this internal light,

and this feeling on which they build so much: these men have, they say, clear light, and they see: they have an awakened sense, and they feel: this cannot, they are sure, be disputed them. For, when a man says he sees or he feels, nobody can deny it him that he does so. But here let me ask; this seeing, is it the perception of the truth of the proposition, or of this, that it is a revelation from GOD? This feeling, is it a perception of an inclination or fancy to do something, or of the Spirit of GOD moving that inclination? These are two very different perceptions, and must be carefully distinguished, if we would not impose upon ourselves. I may perceive the truth of a proposition, and yet not perceive that it is an immediate revelation from GOD. I may perceive the truth of a proposition in Euclid, without its being, or my perceiving it to be a revelation: nay, I may perceive I came not by this knowledge in a natural way, and so may conclude it revealed, without perceiving that it is a revelation from GOD; because there be spirits, which, without being divinely commissioned, may excite those ideas in me, and lay them in such order before my mind, that I may perceive their connexion. So that the knowledge of any proposition coming into my mind, I know not how, is not a perception that it is from GOD. Much less is a strong persuasion, that it is true, a perception that it is from God, or so much as true. But however it be called light and seeing, I suppose, it is at most but belief and assurance: and the proposition taken for a revelation, is not such as they know to be true, but take to be true. For where a proposition is known to be true, revelation is needless: and it is hard to conceive how there can be a revelation to any one of what he knows already. If therefore it be a proposition which they are persuaded, but do not know to be true, whatever they may call it, it is not seeing, but believing. For these are two ways, whereby truth comes into the mind, wholly distinct, so that one is not the other. What I see I know to

be so by the evidence of the thing itself; what I believe, I take to be so upon the testimony of another: but this testimony I must know to be given, or else what ground have I of believing? I must see that it is GOD that reveals this to me, or else I see nothing. The question then here is, how do I know that God is the revealer of this to me; that this impression is made upon my mind by his Holy Spirit, and that therefore I ought to obey it? If I know not this, how great soever the assurance is that I am possessed with, it is groundless; whatever light I pretend to, it is but enthusiasm. For whether the proposition supposed to be revealed, be in itself evidently true, or visibly probable, or by the natural ways of knowledge uncertain, the proposition that must be well-grounded and manifested to be true, is this, that GOD is the revealer of it, and that what I take to be a revelation, is certainly put into my mind by him, and is not an illusion, dropped in by some other spirit, or raised by my own fancy. For, if I mistake not, these men receive it for true, because they presume GOD revealed it. Does it not then stand them upon, to examine on what grounds they presume it to be a revelation from GOD? Or else all their confidence is mere presumption; and this light they are so dazzled with, is nothing but an *ignis fatuus*, that leads them continually round in this circle. It is a revelation, because they firmly believe it; and they believe it, because it is a revelation.

Sect. 11. *Enthusiasm fails of Evidence, that the Proposition is from God.*

In all that is of divine revelation, there is need of no other proof, but that it is an inspiration from GOD: for he can neither deceive, nor be deceived. But how shall it be known, that any proposition in our minds, is a truth infused by GOD; a truth that is revealed to us by him, which he declares to us, and therefore we ought to believe? Here it is that

enthusiasm fails of the evidence it pretends to. For men thus possessed, boast of a light whereby, they say, they are enlightened, and brought into the knowledge of this or that truth. But if they know it to be a truth, they must know it to be so either by its own self-evidence to natural reason, or by the rational proofs that make it out to be so. If they see and know it to be a truth either of these two ways, they in vain suppose it to be a revelation. For they know it to be true by the same way that any other man naturally may know that it is so, without the help of revelation. For thus all the truths, of what kind soever, that men uninspired are enlightened with, came into their minds, and are established there. If they say they know it to be true, because it is a revelation from GOD, the reason is good: but then it will be demanded, how they know it to be a revelation from GOD. If they say by the light it brings with it, which shines bright in their minds, and they cannot resist; I beseech them to consider, whether this be any more than what we have taken notice of already, *viz.* that it is a revelation, because they strongly believe it to be true. For all the light they speak of is but a strong, though ungrounded persuasion of their own minds, that it is a truth. For rational grounds from proofs, that it is a truth, they must acknowledge to have none; for then it is not received as a revelation, but upon the ordinary grounds that other truths are received: and if they believe it to be true, because it is a revelation, and have no other reason for its being a revelation, but because they are fully persuaded, without any other reason, that it is true, they believe it to be a revelation, only because they strongly believe it to be a revelation; which is a very unsafe ground to proceed on, either in our tenets or actions: and what readier way can there be to run ourselves into the most extravagant errors and miscarriages, than thus to set up fancy for our supreme and sole guide, and to believe any proposition to be true, any action to be right, only be-

cause we believe it to be so? The strength of our persuasions is no evidence at all of their own rectitude: crooked things may be as stiff and inflexible as straight; and men may be as positive and peremptory in error as in truth. How come else the untractable zealots in different and opposite parties? For if the light, which every one thinks he has in his mind, which in this case is nothing but the strength of his own persuasion, be an evidence that it is from God, contrary opinions may have the same title to be inspirations; and God will be not only the Father of lights, but of opposite and contradictory lights, leading men contrary ways; and contradictory propositions will be divine truths, if an ungrounded strength of assurance be an evidence, that any proposition is a divine revelation.

Sect. 12. *Firmness of Persuasion, no Proof that any Proposition is from God.*

This cannot be otherwise, whilst firmness of persuasion is made the cause of believing, and confidence of being in the right, is made an argument of truth. St. Paul himself believed he did well, and that he had a call to it, when he persecuted the Christians, whom he confidently thought in the wrong: but yet it was he, and not they, who were mistaken. Good men are men still, liable to mistakes, and are sometimes warmly engaged in errors, which they take for divine truths, shining in their minds with the clearest light.

Sect. 13. *Light in the Mind, what.*

Light, true light in the mind is, or can be nothing else but the evidence of the truth of any proposition; and if it be not a self-evident proposition, all the light it has, or can have, is from the clearness and validity of those proofs upon which it is received. To talk of any other light in the understanding, is to put our-

selves in the dark, or in the power of the prince of darkness, and, by our own consent, to give ourselves up to delusion, to believe a lie: for if strength of persuasion be the light which must guide us, I ask, how shall any one distinguish between the delusions of Satan, and the inspirations of the Holy Ghost? He can transform himself into an angel of light. And they who are led by this son of the morning, are as fully satisfied of the illumination, *i. e.* are as strongly persuaded that they are enlightend by the Spirit of GOD, as any one who is so: they acquiesce and rejoice in it, are acted by it; and nobody can be more sure, nor more in the right, (if their own strong belief may be judge), than they.

Sect. 14. *Revelation must be judged of by Reason.*

He therefore that will not give himself up to all the extravagancies of delusion and error, must bring this guide of his light within to the trial. GOD, when he makes the prophet, does not unmake the man: he leaves all his faculties in their natural state, to enable him to judge of his inspirations, whether they be of divine original or no. When he illuminates the mind with supernatural light, he does not extinguish that which is natural. If he would have us assent to the truth of any proposition, he either evidences that truth by the usual methods of natural reason, or else makes it known to be a truth, which he would have us assent to, by his authority, and convinces us that it is from him, by some marks which reason cannot be mistaken in. Reason must be our last judge and guide in every thing. I do not mean, that we must consult reason, and examine whether a proposition revealed from GOD can be made out by natural principles; and if it cannot, that then we may reject it: but consult it we must, and by it examine whether it be a revelation from GOD or no: and if reason finds it to be revealed from God, reason then declares for it, as much as for any other

truth, and makes it one of her dictates. Every conceit that thoroughly warms our fancies, must pass for an inspiration, if there be nothing but the strength of our persuasions, whereby to judge of our persuasions. If reason must not examine their truth by something extrinsical to the persuasions themselves, inspirations and delusions, truth and falsehood, will have the same measure, and will not be possible to be distinguished.

Sect. 15. *Belief no Proof of Revelation.*

If this internal light, or any proposition which under that title we take for inspired, be conformable to the principles of reason, or to the word of God, which is attested revelation, reason warrants it, and we may safely receive it for true, and be guided by it in our belief and actions: if it receive no testimony nor evidence from either of these rules, we cannot take it for a revelation, or so much as for true, till we have some other mark that it is a revelation, besides our believing that it is so. Thus we see the holy men of old, who had revelations from God, had something else besides that internal light of assurance in their own minds, to testify to them that it was from God. They were not left to their own persuasions alone, that those persuasions were from God, but had outward signs to convince them of the author of those revelations. And when they were to convince others, they had a power given them to justify the truth of their commission from heaven; and by visible signs to assert the divine authority of a message they were sent with. Moses saw the bush burn without being consumed, and heard a voice out of it. This was something besides finding an impulse upon his mind to go to Pharaoh, that he might bring his brethren out of Egypt; and yet he thought not this enough to authorize him to go with that message, till God, by another miracle of his rod turned into a serpent, had assured him of a power to testify his mission by the same miracle repeated before them whom he was

sent to. Gideon was sent by an angel to deliver Israel from the Midianites, and yet he desired a sign to convince him that this commission was from GOD. These, and several the like instances to be found among the prophets of old, are enough to shew, that they thought not an inward seeing or persuasion of their own minds, without any other proof, a sufficient evidence that it was from GOD, though the Scripture does not every where mention their demanding or having such proofs.

§ 16. In what I have said, I am far from denying that GOD can, or doth sometimes enlighten men's minds in the apprehending of certain truths, or excite them to good actions, by the immediate influence and assistance of the Holy Spirit, without any extraordinary signs accompanying it. But in such cases too, we have reason and Scripture, unerring rules, to know whether it be from GOD or no. Where the truth embraced is consonant to the revelation in the written word of GOD, or the action conformable to the dictates of right reason or holy writ, we may be assured that we run no risk in entertaining it as such; because though perhaps it be not an immediate revelation from GOD, extraordinarily operating on our minds, yet we are sure it is warranted by that revelation which he has given us of truth. But it is not the strength of our private persuasion within ourselves, that can warrant it to be a light or motion from heaven; nothing can do that, but the written word of GOD without us, or that standard of reason, which is common to us with all men. Where reason or Scripture is express for any opinion or action, we may receive it as of divine authority; but it is not the strength of our own persuasions which can by itself give it that stamp. The bent of our own minds may favour it as much as we please; that may shew it to be a fondling of our own, but will by no means prove it to be an offspring of heaven, and of divine original.

Printed by Stower & Smallfield, Hackney.

CHURCH REFORM.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS

OF MANY EMINENT DIVINES

OF

THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH,

RELATIVE TO

ITS FURTHER REFORMATION.

COMPILED BY

JAMES MANNING,

LATE SENIOR MINISTER OF GEORGE'S MEETING-HOUSE, EXETER.

"When men have taken out of Christianity what they have foisted into it, there will be but one Religion, as plain in its institutions, doctrines, and discipline, as it is pure in its morals."—*St. Evremond.*

LONDON:

SOLD BY R. HUNTER, 72 ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1833.

[*Price 2s.*]

PRINTED BY RICHARD TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

NOTICE.

The venerable compiler of the following Extracts, has stated in the Preface his views and motives in preparing them for republication. His design was to show the reasonableness of Dissent from the Church of England upon grounds admitted and allowed by many of the greatest ornaments of that Church. It is conceived, that "a cloud of witnesses," so pre-eminent for their piety, their learning, and their patriotism, may also be produced as pleading in favour of that Ecclesiastical Reform, which is expected very shortly to engage the most anxious attention of the Legislature, and as expressing their ideas respecting the principles on

which the further reformation of the Church ought to be pursued. With friendly feelings towards that Church and all its members, and with a sincere desire to advance the cause of truth, and the intellectual, moral, and religious improvement of their country, the work is now issued by the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, to whom its publication has been entrusted.

3 Walbrook Buildings,
Feb. 1833.

PREFACE.

IN bringing forward this Vindication of Dissent from the Church of England, it is far from the wish of the Editor to disturb the good understanding which generally subsists between the Dissenters and the members of the Established Church. The Dissenters highly respect and sincerely rejoice in the great number of learned prelates and worthy clergymen whose abilities and whose virtues are an ornament to Religion.

Never will the Dissenters forget the liberality and kindness which they experienced on the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, when a majority of the Bishops not only concurred with, but generously supported the other branches of the Legislature in that measure. They are entitled to the cordial thanks of all the friends of civil and religious liberty.

The Editor is happy in an acquaintance with many of the clergy whose character reflects honour on their profession. They have his best wishes; and he says, in the language of Holy Writ, "Grace, mercy and peace be multiplied upon them!" This is a sacrifice to truth and friendship; and he will

never scruple to go a little out of his way to perform so sacred and pleasing a rite.

The object of this publication is to vindicate the Dissenters, by showing what is the judgement of many learned dignitaries, and of some of the greatest ornaments of the Church, with regard to a revisal and alteration of its religious services, in consequence of the changes which have been produced in men's religious opinions by that great innovator Time. The testimonies produced are so numerous and so strong, that it will not, it is imagined, be easy for persons unfavourable to the proposed improvements, to oppose such a stream of authorities, or with sufficient reason to plead against what has been urged with so much evidence. To their candid and unprejudiced judgement this collection of testimonies is submitted, in the confidence that they will at least acknowledge that Dissent is not so entirely unreasonable as it has been sometimes represented to be.

CONTENTS.

	Page		Page
Absolution	19—20	Liturgy	49—50
Alterations	1—18	Magistrate, Civil,	50—52
Articles	21—28	Ordination	52
Authority, Human,	28—32	Original Sin	52—55
Baptism	32—33	Schism	55—60
Bishops & Presbyters	34—36	Sufficiency of Scripture	61
Burial Service	36—37	New Translation	61—64
Christ, Sole Lawgiver,	37—38	Tithes	64—65
Creeds	38—44	Toleration	65—66
Dissenters	44—45	Uniformity	66—69
Establishments	45—47	Unitarianism	69—71
Free Inquiry	47—49	Worship	71—72

WRITERS QUOTED.

Archbishops.

			Page
Bramhall,	Archbishop of	Armagh	21
Cranmer	——	Canterbury	34
Laud	——	Canterbury	13, 56
Newcome	——	Armagh	62
Sutton	——	Canterbury	45
Tenison	——	Canterbury	40
Tillotson	——	Canterbury	15
Usher	——	Armagh	34
Wake	——	Canterbury	4, 71

BISHOPS.

		Page
Alley, Bishop of	Exeter	35
Bathurst ——	Norwich	45, 51
Bedell ——	Dromore	44
Beveridge ——	Asaph	16
Bilson ——	Winchester	34
Bull ——	St. Davids	71
Burnet ——	Sarum	9, 22, 32, 34, 52
Clayton ——	Clogher	9, 40, 47, 54, 66
Croft ——	Hereford	7
Gauden ——	Exeter	6
Hall ——	Exeter	72
Hoadly ——	Sarum	9, 36, 37
Hooper ——	Gloucester	35
Jewel ——	Sarum	35, 61
Kennet ——	Peterborough	65
Law ——	Carlisle	17
Lowth ——	London	62
Marsh ——	Peterborough	48, 63
Morley ——	Worcester	22
Pilkington ——	Durham	35
Sanderson ——	Lincoln	18
Sherlock ——	London	2, 21
Shipley ——	Carlisle	30, 58
Stillingfleet——	Worcester	21, 38, 49, 57, 67
Tomline ——	Winchester	41
Taylor ——	Down	14, 40, 41, 52, 55
Watson ——	Landaff	16, 21, 40, 43, 69
Warburton——	Gloucester	50
Wilkins ——	Chester	49
Wettenhall——	Cork	4

CLERGYMEN.

	Page
Dr. Tucker, Dean of Gloucester	20
Dr. Prideaux, Dean of Norwich	5, 56
Dr. Blackburne, Archdeacon of Cleaveland	23, 29, 33, 47
Dr. Jefferey, Archdeacon of Norwich	15
Dr. Paley, Archdeacon of Carlisle	1, 13, 46, 59, 72
Dr. G. Clarke, Vicar of Great Waltham, Essex	61, 67
Dr. S. Clarke	19, 29
Dr. Grisdale, Chaplain to George III.	68
Dr. Whitby	8, 28
Dr. Strype	24
Dr. Rogers, Subdean of Wells, and King's Chaplain	14
Dr. Stebbing	19
Dr. Sykes	39
Dr. Bennet	37
Dr. Nichols	10
Dr. Edwards	44
Dr. Thomas Burnet	55
Dr. Cudworth	44
Dr. Reed	5
Dr. Jortin	3
Mr. Prebendary Sturges	11, 23
Mr. John Hales, of Eton	50, 56
Mr. Bowman	25
Mr. Temple, Vicar of Eastley, Yorkshire	27
Chillingworth	42, 58
Mr. Olyffe	10
Mr. Needham	11
Mr. Dawson, Rector of Rinfield	64
Mr. Manning, Rector of Diss	38, 70
Mr. Macauley	14
Mr. Tate, Rector of Marske	66
Mr. Foster, Rector of Colchester	47
Mr. Jones, Rector of Alconbury	27, 33
Mr. Penn	12, 25, 31, 51, 59
Mr. Hooker	29

VINDICATION OF DISSENT:

EXTRACTED FROM

THE WORKS OF DIVINES

OF

THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

ALTERATIONS.

ARCHDEACON PALEY.

AS a man who attacks a flourishing establishment writes with an halter round his neck, few will be found to attempt alterations but men of more spirit than prudence, of more sincerity than caution, of eager and impetuous tempers: consequently, if we are to wait for improvement till the cool, the calm, the discreet part of mankind begin it, till church governors solicit, or ministers of state propose it, I will venture to pronounce that (without *His* interposition with whom nothing is impossible) we may remain as we are till the renovation of all things. .....I know not whether I ought to mention, among so many serious reasons, that even the governors of the church themselves would find their own ease and account in an alteration. For besides the

difficulty of defending these decayed fortifications, and the indecency of deserting them, they either are, or will soon find themselves, in the situation of a master of a family whose servants know more of his secrets than it is proper to know, and whose whispers and whose threats will drain the "apostolic chamber" dry. It is not giving truth a fair chance to decide points at one certain time and by one set of men, which had much better be left to the successive enquiries of different ages and different people. Keeping people out of churches who might be admitted consistently with every end of public worship, and excluding men from communion who desire to embrace it upon the terms that God prescribes, is certainly not *encouraging*, but rather *causing* them to forsake the assembling of themselves together.—*Tracts*, 42, 43.

BISHOP SHERLOCK.

We have reason to hope that the church of England, which at the beginning of the Reformation took such prudent care not to offend the Papists by going further from them than was necessary, will, whenever it is likely to do good, condescend a great deal further to meet the Dissenters; for while the internal decency and solemnity of worship is secured, no wise and good man will think much to change a changeable ceremony. And let us heartily pray to God that there may be this good and peaceable disposition of mind in us all towards a happy union.—*Sermon before the Lord Mayor*, 1688.

DR. JORTIN.

There are propositions contained in the liturgy and articles which no man of common sense among us believes. No one believes that all the members of the Greek church are damned because they admit not the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; yet the Athanasian creed, according to the usual and obvious sense of the words, teaches this. No one believes himself obliged to keep the *Sabbath* day; yet the liturgy, strictly interpreted, requires it. Subscriptions and tests are supposed to be admirable methods to keep out the heterodox. ....The next step towards the increase of Christ's kingdom must be further improvement of Christianity, and of those who receive and profess it. The church of Rome is not the only church that wants amendment. Other Christian societies which have separated themselves from her, and from her grosser defects, are departed, more or less, from the original simplicity of the Gospel, and have mixed some of the doctrines of men with the word of God, and so stand in need of some improvement. It is therefore hoped a time will come when religion will have a fairer and a more alluring aspect, when Christians will be united, not in opinions on theological subjects, for that is impossible while men are men, but that they will be united in benevolence and charity, in intercommunion, and in one common and simple profession of faith.—*Rem. on Eccl. Hist. v.* 3. *p.* 445.

BISHOP WETTENHALL.

I do not conceive that an alteration of an expression, or perhaps here and there of a whole prayer or two, for the sake of some unsatisfied but otherwise regular Christians, would break the harmony and beauty of our worship, or disturb the peace and union of our churches. There are some collects, and perhaps rubricks too, which, with all due submission, I humbly conceive might be altered for the better; and further, if the obligation to a ceremony or two were taken off, the benefit which might redound to the church would be very considerable, both in respect of proselytes and strength thereby, as perhaps in other points. He that shall say that under our present establishment all that is established is absolutely the *best* and nothing can be *mended*, says more than our church does, and a difficult proof lies before him. There is something which is yet to be wished. People will not be persuaded but that in these days they stand upon the shoulders of all who have lived before them.—*Treatise on Prayer*, *p.* 201-2.

ARCHBISHOP WAKE.

And now, my lords, let any impartial person consider, how could our excellent liturgy have been the worse if a few more doubtful expressions had been changed for plainer and clearer, and a passage or two, which, however capable of a just defence, yet in many cases seem harsh to some even of our

own communion, had been wholly left at liberty in such cases to be omitted altogether, or been so qualified as to remove all exception against them. What was there in such a design that could be justly esteemed prejudicial to the church ?—*Speech at the Trial of Sacheverell.*

It has never gone well with the church of Christ since men have been so narrow-minded as to mix the controversies of faith with their public forms of worship, and have made their liturgies, instead of being offices of devotion to God, become tests and censures of the opinions of their brethren.—*Sermons, v.* 1. *p.* 195.

Dr. REED.

Some blemishes are become, in the opinion of many, the most unanswerable argument against our religion, and indeed an offence to almost all our communion, who see them not without inward trouble and concern, as others do with a malicious joy and pleasure. I may venture to say, there is not the hundredth man of our church, that doth not inwardly condemn and wish a reformation of the particulars.—*Essay on Simony,* 1737. *p.* 218.

Dr. PRIDEAUX.

It is the opinion of many that there are some defects in our present liturgy; such as that there are whole offices wanting in it, and that some of those

offices which are established do not, in all particulars, answer the occasions for which they are appointed, as may be instanced in the office for visitation of the sick, in which it is objected, there are some particulars which cannot always be properly said. In the office for the burial of the dead, we express our hopes of the salvation of *all* that are buried, though they may be atheists, deists, and such as so declared themselves to the last. In the prayer for the parliament, the king who reigneth over us, whosoever he is, is stiled Our most *religious* sovereign; whereas it may happen that we may have a king who hath no religion at all, as some may say was the case with Charles II. And besides these, there are many other particulars in different parts of the service that are objected against, especially by those that dissent from us, which might be much easier corrected than defended.—*Life of Dr. Prideaux, p.* 59-60.

BISHOP GAUDEN.

The serious and speedy review of the English liturgy, as it can be of no more inconvenience than a new translation of the Bible, if it be for the better, so I hope it may be of good use for the explaining of some words and phrases which are now antiquated, obscure, and out of vulgar understanding; also may serve for quickening and improving some passages which seem less devotional and emphatic than they may be easily made; also for the supply of some things of daily praise and thanksgiving to

God, which duty seems less full and explicit in the liturgy. This work, once well and wisely done, as it may by God's blessing, would much tend to the satisfaction of all sober Christians. Therefore in lesser things I can humbly and cheerfully consent to such pious, prudent, and improving alterations.—*Considerations touching the Liturgy, p.* 22.

BISHOP CROFT.

I humbly beseech the governors of the church calmly to consider, were it not better to have such a form of service as would satisfy the most. Some things I could mention in the Book of Common Prayer (though no way ill in themselves) fit to be altered, and would obviously appear so to every wise man, were it resolved to compose such a form as would take in most of this nation; which I humbly conceive governors should in conscience endeavour, becoming all things to all men to gain some, though not all, yet haply gain all in process of time. There are men who would most passionately and irreligiously cry "We will not leave one ceremony nor any one line of our Common Prayer, to gain thousands of idiot sectaries and mad fanatics; no, if you alter that, we will leave the church and go to the papists' mass." If these be not as simple sectaries and mad fanatics as any whatever, let God and his holy angels judge. Certainly his religion is in vain, who would abandon the substance for want of the ceremonies; surely he hath a very ignorant mind, who hath not learnt that obedience is better than sacrifice and whole burnt

offerings; and surely a very uncharitable mind, that would not leave ninety and nine unnecessary ceremonies to bring one sinful strayed sheep into the congregation. But as for you, my reverend Fathers of the church, I hope you will consult with Scripture in this mighty affair, and model all according to the rules of meekness, charity, and compassionate tenderness; and endeavour, with prudent admonitions, to rectify the errors of these too zealous ceremonists. —*Naked Truth, p.* 23-4. 1675.

DR. WHITBY.

It is certain our church hath already altered her liturgy at several times and in several parts, viz. lessons, festivals, ceremonies, rubricks, collects, prayers, the form of administering the sacraments, the catechisms, confirmation, marriage, visitation of the sick, the burial of the dead, and the commination; and that so much, that if our rulers would be pleased to change the present liturgy as much from what it *is*, as it is altered from what it *was* in the days of Edward VI., I really believe the alteration would render it acceptable to many who now refuse submission to it. And why it may not now be altered, as well as in the time of Queen Elizabeth, and after the return of our late sovereign (Charles II.), I am not able to divine. And if these things might be altered without reflection on their wisdom, why may not other things be so?—*Protestant Reconciler, p.* 233 & 269.

BISHOP HOADLEY.

Our liturgical forms ought to be revised and amended for our sakes though there were no Dissenters in the land.

BISHOP CLAYTON.

I am persuaded that if my lords the bishops will show themselves inclined to amend what they cannot but acknowledge to be amiss, they will find the laity ready to assist and support them rather than otherwise. I wish something were done to convince the world that the clergy of the church are not averse to a reformation of some parts of her public service, since otherwise they may give offence by their obstinacy and seeming infallibility, and if a storm should arise may run a risk of having the tree torn up by the roots, which they might have saved by a little pruning.—*Essay on Spirit, Preface, p.* 53.

BISHOP BURNET.

I wish some things may be taken away. No inconvenience could follow on leaving out the cross in baptism &c. and on regulating the indecency of singing prayers. All bowings to the altar have at least an ill appearance, and are of no use. The excluding parents from being sponsors at baptism, and requiring them to procure others, is extremely inconvenient, and makes them to be a mockery rather than a solemn sponsion in too many.—*Conclusion of his History.*

MR. OLYFFE.

We must needs say that we cannot but heartily wish that our governors would not continue to insist upon the use of those things which we desire to have altered. One would think that external, indifferent modes and signs might be well spared without any detriment to religion! Religion is never advanced by being embodied in externals; it then becomes only a shibboleth and distinction which those only have a zeal for who have least of the vital flame of love to God and man.—*Defence of Ministerial Conformity, p.* 131.

DR. NICHOLS.

A commission was issued in 1689 to ten bishops and twenty eminent divines, to meet and prepare such alterations in the liturgy and canons, and such proposals for reformation in the ecclesiastical courts, and to consider of such other matters as in their judgements might most conduce to the improvement of the liturgy. But all their amendments were set aside by the majority of the convocation. Such was the fate of this attempt to render the service of the established church as pure as possible, and to clear away those parts which from that day to the present continue to offend so many respectable and conscientious persons. Considering the character and abilities of those who undertook the task, it can never be sufficiently lamented that their endeavours proved so unsuccessful. For Archbishop Wake, speaking of them before the House of Lords, thus

expresses himself, "They were a set of men than which this church was never at any time blessed with either wiser or better since it was a church." And when we find among them names whose memories we revere,—Lloyd, Compton, Burnet, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Prideaux,—among others, it is clear that posterity has confirmed the testimony of this sagacious prelate, and regrets the more the loss of their beneficent intentions.

Denique spondeam, me minimè repugnaturum esse, si res aliquas indifferentes, etsi longâ vetustate venerandas, vel è medio tolli, aut saltem pro arbitrio pastoris usurpandas relinqui. Paci ego publicæ consulo."—*Nichols, Apparatus Def. Eccles. Angl. c.* 17. *p.* 349.

MR. NEEDHAM.

I freely own that our discipline is defective, our canons not so well chosen, nor our liturgy so perfect as it ought to be.—*Visitation Sermon, p.* 14.

MR. PREBENDARY STURGES.

I am not more desirous that candid, liberal, and intelligent readers should be satisfied with those parts of our church establishment, than I am that their attention should be directed to those parts which are capable of improvement, and which call for it. Though it must be expected that all human institutions will have their defects, this is no reason why endeavours should not be used to lessen and

correct them. Length of time and change of circumstances produce of themselves inconveniences in things which were planned at first with the greatest wisdom; they make what was originally well adapted to the purposes intended, unfit and inapplicable; they produce improvements in knowledge which, in justice to ourselves, we should adopt; so that human institutions of every kind will grow, from these causes only, less perfect and useful, except they are from time to time refitted and readjusted. This must be the case of every national church which has long subsisted; and it seems reasonable to use the same conduct with respect to that, as all wise nations do in other parts of legislation, to make such alterations and amendments in ecclesiastical regulations as any improvement in religious knowledge or change of circumstances may require. That this should be done, not wantonly and unnecessarily, will readily be admitted; but surely we seem too tender, too much afraid of moving a stone of our church, though ever so gently, as if on being touched the whole fabric should fall to pieces.—*On the Present State of the Church, p.* 3.

Rev. JAMES PENN, A.B.

Under-master of Christ's Hospital, and Lecturer of St. Anne, and St. John Zachary, London.

Hath not the Church a power of instituting rites and ceremonies? It must be granted: but there may not be the same reason for continuing, as making them. Her institutions are not to be supposed

perfect, without any defect, incapable of improvement, and not admitting of any alteration. A change of times and circumstances may make a revisal, alteration, or even an abolition of some things necessary. Human affairs are in so fluctuating and inconstant a state, that civil society is not to be governed by any certain and determinate laws. Incidents will occur to render some useless, and to frame new ones. The government of the church, no more than that of the state, is not to be directed by absolute and unalterable laws.—*Tracts, p.* 22.

ARCHDEACON PALEY.

Whatever can render religion more rational, renders it more credible; he who, by a diligent and faithful examination of the original records, dismisses from his system one article which contradicts the apprehension, the experience, or the reason of mankind, does more towards recommending the belief, and with the belief the influence of Christianity, to the understanding and consciences of serious inquirers, and through them to universal reception, than can be effected by a thousand contenders for creeds and ordinances of human appointment.—*Moral Phil.—Dedication to Bp. Law.*

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

The Church should not be so bound up, as that upon just and further evidence she may not revise that which in any case hath slipt her.—*Dedication to Charles I. preparatory to Conference with Fisher.*

MR. MACAULEY, M.A. & F.R.S.

It will be readily granted by every candid and impartial member of the church, that some alterations for the better might be made in our liturgic forms; some obsolete expressions might be altered, Scriptural phrases might be substituted in a few instances for scholastic terms, and there might be several abbreviations and omissions which, without discomposing the frame and order of the ritual of the church, would render the superstructure more fair and proportionate, and unite all who wish well to our Sion in the bond of peace.—*Single Sermon, Appendix*, 1796.

DR. ROGERS,
Subdean of Wells, and King's Chaplain.

As I acknowledge for myself, so I presume I may for the greater part of my brethren, that we judge our present constitution might be in many respects altered for the better. Some of us imagine we see defects in one part, and some in another.—*Address to Diss. p.* 87.

BISHOP TAYLOR.

Bodies of confessions and articles do much hurt, by becoming instruments of separating and dividing communions, and making uncertain and unnecessary propositions a certain means of schism and disunion. "Lord, I believe thou art the Son of God who was to come into the world:" that was Mar-

tha's creed. "Thou art the Christ the Son of God:" that was Peter's creed. "We know and believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God:" that was the creed of the Apostles. "This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent:" that was the creed which our Lord himself made for Martha, and questioned her upon the article, "Believest thou this?"—*Ductor Dubitantium.*

DR. JEFFEREY,
Archdeacon of Norwich.

No man or company of men whatever can make any part of true religion; and if any thing be *made* by men and imposed as religion, it is not true religion, but superstition or false religion. Men have made, and have mixed that false religion with the true religion which God made. The Pagans did so with natural religion, the Jews and Samaritans did so with the Mosaic, and the Papists have done so with the Christian religion.—*Religion of the Bible, p.* 22.

ARCHBISHOP TENISON.

Some who have well considered all the alterations and amendments made in the year 1661, which amount to the number of 600, are sufficiently convinced that if they had reason for those changes, there is equal if not greater reason for further improvements. If they had foreseen what has since come to pass, I charitably believe they would not

have done all that they did, and just so much and no more.—*Disc. on Eccles. Commiss. in* 1689.

As to any favour to Dissenters, none is intended, but what will be entirely consistent with our constitution; and I hope it will not be thought any crime for the bishops and clergy of our church to be willing to enlarge its communion, by any methods which may be likely to gain others, and yet not injure our own establishment.—*Ibid.*

BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

Nothing was antiently more usual with the churches of God, than, when times required it, to change the laws made by themselves, to abrogate old ones, and substitute others.—*Latin Serm. before the Convocat.* 1689.

BISHOP WATSON.

Whatever truth there may be in the proposition which asserts that the multitude is fond of innovation (and I do not deny there is some truth in it, for we know that the multitude can on some occasions see what is right), I think that the proposition which asserts that the priesthood is averse from reformation is far more generally true. Who was it that crucified the Saviour of the world, for attempting to reform the religion of their country? The Jewish priesthood. Who was it that drowned the idols with the blood of Christians for attempting to abolish Paganism? The Pagan priesthood. Who

was it that persecuted to flames and death those who in the time of Wickliffe and his followers laboured to reform the errors of Popery? The Popish priesthood. Who was it, and who is it, that both in England and Ireland since the Reformation—But I check myself, being unwilling to reflect upon the dead, or to exasperate the living, whom would to God I could conciliate (I say not to my opinions, but) to a charitable temper towards those who differ from them, and to a dispassionate consideration of the subjects concerning which they differ. Councils and synods, convocations and assemblies of churchmen have used so much wood, hay, and stubble in erecting, altering, and repairing religious establishments, that Wickliffe and Luther were almost at a loss to discover religion itself. Christianity has been so corrupted, that it will be the work of ages to restore it to its original purity; and Dr. Cudworth had reason on his side, when he doubted whether the truth of the Christian religion was more apparent in having prevailed against its enemies, or in not having been smothered by the frauds and forgeries of its friends.—*Considerations on Revising the Liturgy, &c.* 1790.

BISHOP LAW.

Let us be intent on studying the pure word of God, and careful to interpret it in such a manner as to do most honour to its author, and at all times encourage a free and impartial study of it. It is now high time to do this and to awake out of sleep,

since our reformation is much nearer than when we first believed: and it is to be wished that we ourselves would examine our own state, before others are obliged to do it for us; that we were disposed to help and forward, rather than check the progress of serious inquiry, and stop any further improvements in the knowledge of that, which of all things deserves and wants them most, rather than withstand a general reformation in religion, by rigorously insisting on, and obtruding such things for doctrine, as are the commandments of men, and very foreign to the essence of it; instead of either entertaining that anti-christian kind of spirit, which calls down fire from heaven on all who don't receive us, which delights in straitening the way that leads to life, and shutting the kingdom of heaven against men. As we live in a more enlightened age, and are entrusted with a greater share of talents, let us be persuaded to walk worthy of it, and endeavour to excel others as much in our improvements.—*Theory of Religion, p.* 195, 196. *edit.* 1745.

BISHOP SANDERSON.

The church of England, both in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, and in the articles of her confession, and in sundry passages in the homilies, occasionally hath, in as plain and express terms as can be desired, declared to the world, that any of her orders and constitutions may be retained, abolished, or altered from time to time, and at all times, as the governors for the time being shall judge to serve best unto edification.—*Visitat. an. Serm.* 1641.

ABSOLUTION.

DR. CLARKE.

Profane beyond profaneness is the doctrine of those who contend that the Apostles, much less any of their fallible successors, had a discretionary power of forgiving or retaining whose sins they pleased.—*Clarke's Sermons, v.* 8. *p.* 17.

DR. STEBBING.

Some of the methods practised in the primitive churches with regard to restoring penitents have very much the air of farce. For the first thousand years the forms of absolution were all in the form of prayers, and not in the form of a peremptory definitive sentence, as it now stands in the Popish forms, and in one of our own from them. The Popish form of ordination is also retained in the church of England. The two forms are relative to each other and cannot stand separately, for the one conveys the power which the other exercises; and they are novelties alike, and it is very much to be wished they were properly altered. Dissenters would find less matter for censure, and infidels for profane railing.—*Instructions to a Parish Minister, p.* 2.

The late Bishop Bull, who was one of the ablest scholars, the staunchest churchmen, and the best

Christians of his time, when he was upon his death-bed refused to have this form (absolution) read, and ordered the minister who attended him to use that form which stands in the office for the holy communion in its stead.—*Ibid.*

I freely blame those who grasp at the shadow of authority, which in truth and substance we must all renounce. What else do we when we pretend to absolve conscience? We may use a hundred distinctions if we please; we may say that the absolution is not authoritative, but declaratory; or that it is not judicial, but ministerial; but if you would speak to be understood, you must say, that with respect to any real internal effect it is *nothing;* and you will speak truth too; for all the rest, if you would preserve to God his prerogative to forgive sins, are words without meaning.—*Ibid, p.* 37, 39, 51, 52.

Dr. TUCKER.

The form of absolution is justly liable to censure; for it pretends to such knowledge of the human heart, as cannot belong to mortal without an express revelation. Dr. Stebbing in his excellent tract against Popery fairly gives it up. I do the same, and esteem it to be among those real blemishes, spots, and imperfections which ought to be removed. —*Six Sermons, No.* 5.

ARTICLES.

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL.

The transforming of indifferent opinions into necessary articles of faith hath been the *insana laurus*, or cursed bay-tree, the cause of all our brawling and contention.— *Vindication of himself and the Episcopal Clergy, p.* 241.

BISHOP SHERLOCK.

No church has, nor all the churches, any authority to make articles of faith. Jesus Christ was the author and finisher of the faith, to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing can be taken away.—12*th Sermon.*

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.

The pretence of the Romanists of a power in the church to define matters of faith is presumptuous and arrogant, being the highest degree of lording it over the Christian world.—*Rational Account of the Ground of Protestant Reformation, ch.* 2. *p.* 76.

BISHOP WATSON.

I used to say, holding the New Testament in my hand, *En sacrum Codicem!* Here is the fountain of truth. Why do you follow the streams derived

from it by the sophistry, or polluted by the passions of men? If you can bring proof against any thing delivered in this book, I shall think it my duty to reply to you. Articles of churches are not of divine authority. Have done with them, for they may be true, they may be false; and appeal to the book itself.

BISHOP BURNET.

The requiring subscription to the thirty-nine articles is a great imposition. The greatest part subscribe without ever examining them, and others do it though they can hardly satisfy their consciences about some things in them. Churches and societies are much better secured by laws than by subscriptions. It is a more reasonable as well as a more easy method of government.

BISHOP MORLEY.

Bishop Morley told Mr. Sprint, a nonconformist minister, that he must not philosophize upon the words Assent and Consent, nor suppose that the Parliament did by *assent* mean an act of the understanding, and by *consent* an act of the will; for no more was intended, than that the person so declaring intended to *read* the book; adding, if he (Sprint) would make the declaration in the words of the Act of Uniformity, and then say that he thereby meant no more than that he would read the Common Prayer, he would admit him into a living.—*Calamy's Abridgement of Baxter, v.* 2. *p.* 341.

PREBENDARY STURGES.

As Christianity should be made, as much as possible, in the public profession of it, what it is in itself, a religion of benevolence and concord, Christians should be invited by every conciliatory, every accommodating measure to join in one profession. All invidious distinctions should be removed, smaller differences should be dropped by all persons, provided that in greater things they can be made to agree. Now to multiply the public opinions by which one church is distinguished from others, on those subjects especially which are difficult and disputable, is to multiply the conditions required from those who would accede to it, and to make their union less practicable. I confess our articles appear liable to these objections. The particulars of them are too numerous, the subject of them of a most obscure and disputable kind. On both these accounts the assent required from our clergy may appear too strict, and other Christians may be discouraged from joining in communion with us.—*Considerations on the Present State of the Church.*

ARCHDEACON BLACKBURNE.

It was a great misfortune to the Protestants that their confessions should abound with explications of so many minute points of scholastic theology, which, without stopping one Popish mouth with respect to the general accusation of heresy, tended so manifestly to narrow their original foundation, and

to give their common adversaries so great an advantage occasioned by their explications so utterly irreconcilable. It was a greater misfortune still, that they should think of establishing their explications as tests of orthodoxy, by requiring their ministers to swear to them, and subscribe them as an indispensable condition of admitting them to the pastoral office. Had they been contented with a solemn declaration on the part of their teachers and pastors, that they received the sacred Scriptures as the Word of God, and would instruct people out of these only, leaving them at liberty to disown whatever, after proper examination, they judged inconsistent with them, in all human probability the interests of Popery would have declined, and the true ends of reformation have been more speedily as well as more effectually promoted.—*Confessional, p.* 18, 19.

DR. STRYPE.

It is the misery of Christendom that we should build too much upon articles of doctrine, upon opinions, tenets, and systems; and they must be subscribed to, sworn to, and believed, which causeth almost all the divisions of the Christian world. We are so earnest in asserting the orthodoxy of our espoused doctrines, that we most lamentably fall out, break peace, love and charity, and wretchedly neglect the weightier matters of the Law, judgement, mercy, and faith, and the practice of truth and righteousness.—*Sermon preached at Hackney, Sept.* 21, 1717, *p.* 12.

Mr. BOWMAN.

It is no slight matter for a person solemnly to declare he believes a thing, when he knows nothing about it; but what is it to *subscribe* that he verily believes such a set of articles in their literal and grammatical sense, as agreeable to the Word of God, when perhaps he never read them, at least never compared them with the Scriptures. Yet there is abundant reason to believe that this is the case with thousands. I desire, with shame and humiliation, to acknowledge it was my own.—*Review of the Doctrine of the Reformation, p.* 9.

Rev. JAMES PENN.

Subjects purely speculative should be left free. If some are so bold as to determine, who hath a right so to do, in matters of whose nature, it is generally allowed, no one can have any intuition, perception, or knowledge? Who then will presume to say positively what a man is, or is not to believe? To attempt an explanation of these things, or to make men understand them, is equally ridiculous as to bid the blind to see or the deaf to hear. How necessary it is therefore to read the Scripture, that we might with certainty know what we should believe, and might not be loaded with articles, which, if not altogether useless, are indifferent, and will not make us either the wiser or the better. Our

time will be more properly employed in learning our duty, than in exercising a vain curiosity after mysteries. Bad actions are worse than erroneous opinions. The latter flow from a weak and mistaken judgement; the former proceed from a wicked and corrupt heart. The one will be forgiven; the other, without repentance, never.

Protestants would be more easily united, and deists would have less enmity against Christianity, if there were no compulsion used to subscribe articles of faith which they cannot understand, nor comprehend, and which those who demand subscription cannot explain to them, nor afford sufficient arguments to recommend the subscription as reasonable. Articles of faith should be few in number, and such as are apparently and absolutely necessary, so that to refuse assent to them would be absurd. Scripture is an authority which all Christians will submit to with pleasure, and every candid enquirer of truth attend to. The end of Scripture is man's happiness; it cannot therefore have any design to deceive or impose upon him, nor will it require his assent to things superfluous or unworthy of his belief. Private or public interpretations of it may be wrong, more frequently take their rise from a love of wealth and the acquisition of power, than the principle of doing good to mankind; and the authority they acquire generally proceeds from compulsion, fear, or interest.—*Tracts, p.* 13.

MR. TEMPLE.

Vicar of Eastley, Yorkshire.

Will it be said that this reasoning will render subscription unnecessary, and leave Christianity exposed by removing the bulwarks of a national establishment? I will not dissemble my sentiments; I believe I shall be accountable for what I now say, or leave unsaid, and sure I am I have no views but to serve the cause of our common Saviour and Redeemer. I can see no harm Christianity would receive if fewer subscriptions were required, nor can understand what security any human bond can give to it. Is it not founded on the adamantine rock of God's Word, which no human force can undermine? And why should men be sent thither with minds lost and bewildered in human speculations? Was not the Almighty able to unfold his own mind, or does he need the feeble aid of finite abilities to direct his infinite and incomprehensible understanding?—*The Written Word of God the only Rule of Faith and Manners, in Three Discourses*, 8*vo.*

REV. JOHN JONES,

Vicar of Alconbury.

Are our thirty-nine articles liable to no just and reasonable exceptions, when compared with the genuine sense of the Word of God, as that sense at this day appears to learned and inquisitive men, who have examined the Scriptures without bias, and are possessed of all proper qualifications and

helps to study them to advantage? Would it be impossible, or very difficult, to compile a system of divine truths, more agreeable to Scripture and less burthensome to the conscience of sincere enquirers? And has it not long been, and still is judged, by some of our wisest governors in the church, that the present times require a different set of articles, and better adapted to present exigencies? though for the sake of peace, and of the true interests of the church, we shall always wish they may be drawn up with a just latitude, as well as with a sincere regard to Scripture truth.—*Free and Candid Disquisitions, v.* 1. *p.* 162.

HUMAN AUTHORITY.

DR. WHITBY.

The duty of not offending a weak brother is inconsistent with all human authority of making laws concerning indifferent things. It is not lawful for superiors to impose any thing in the worship of God that is not antecedently necessary. To require any man to believe what we confess to be a mystery, is to require him to believe what God hath not revealed in his Word, for what is truly a mystery cannot be a revelation by God.— *Whitby on Mysteries.*

ARCHDEACON BLACKBURNE.

Lodge your church authority in what hands you will, and limit it with whatever restrictions you think proper, you cannot assert to it a right of deciding in controversies of faith and doctrine, or in other words, a right to require assent to a certain sense of Scripture, exclusive of other senses, without an unwarrantable interference with those rights of private judgement which are manifestly secured to every individual by the Scriptural terms of Christian liberty, and thereby contradicting the original principles of the Protestant Reformation.—*Confessional, p.* 478.

Dr. CLARKE.

At the Reformation religion began to recover in a great measure out of the great apostasy; when the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles was again declared to be the rule of truth, in which were contained all things necessary to faith and manners. Had that declaration been constantly adhered to, and human authority in matters of faith been disclaimed in *deed* as well as in *words*, there had been possibly no more schisms in the church of God, nor divisions of any considerable moment among Protestants.—*Introd. to the Script. Doct. 2nd ed., p.* 8, 9.

Mr. HOOKER.

I grant that proof derived from the authority of man's judgement is not able to work that assurance

which doth grow by a stronger proof; and therefore, although ten thousand general councils should set down one and the same definitive sentence concerning any point of religion whatsoever, yet one demonstrative reason alleged, or one testimony cited from the Word of God himself to the contrary, could not choose but oversway them all; inasmuch as for them to be deceived is not so impossible, as it is that demonstrative reason or Divine testimony should deceive. For men to be tied and led by authority, as it were with a kind of captivity of judgement; and though there be reason to the contrary, not to listen to it, but follow like beasts the first in the herd; this were brutish. That the authority of men should prevail with men either against or above reason, is no part of *our* belief. Companies of learned men, though they be never so great and reverend, are to yield unto reason, the weight whereof is no whit prejudiced by the simplicity of the person which doth allege it.—*Eccles. Polity, 2nd edit. p.* 18.

BISHOP SHIPLEY.

A great majority of these dissenting clergy, I am told, declare against all human authority in matters of religion. They hold that no church has a right to impose an article of faith on any other religious community. I believe from my heart that they say true; at least if they do not, he that can refute them is a much abler man than myself. Now, my Lords, these are men who deserve our esteem for their sci-

ence, their literature, their critical study of the Scriptures, and for their excellent writings, either in defending or teaching common Christianity; and, my Lords, they have of late stood almost singly in defence of the natural and religious rights of mankind. —*Speech in the House of Lords.*

Rev. JAMES PENN.

One man may be more learned than another; but is he more infallible? Learning hath been of singular use in the discovery of many truths; and it hath also led men into very gross errors. It is therefore prudent not to trust to any man in things of moment: such matters respecting our faith and manners must be allowed. We have the Scriptures before us, let us read them. From them we are to regulate our conscience, and learn right and wrong. The doctrines they deliver, we are to believe; the duties they prescribe, we are to practise. What others recommend and assert so to be, we are no further concerned to believe and practise, than as they shall appear upon a strict inquiry to be clearly revealed in the Scriptures.—*Tracts, p.* 18.

To read the Scriptures with freedom, and not wholly rely upon human authority, is further necessary, that we might know things truly. Let me instance in the grand division that hath so long subsisted amongst Protestants, concerning the use of certain forms, rites, and ceremonies. How are we to judge of this controversy? By the writings of the different parties? They are both infallible.

By the treatment they show to each other? They have not much candour, and as little of charity. By the manner of managing the dispute? They will allow of none to write with freedom but themselves. By the style? Less of virulence and reproach would be better. By the Scriptures? It is an authority which they both plead, but are unwilling to be determined by it. However we ought to be determined by it, that we may think and practise rightly in this matter. What say they?—nothing more than this, "*Let things be done decently, and in order.*" Is not the manner of worship in the established church according to this rule? If some things were omitted it would not be less so. If they are allowed to be indifferent, should they be maintained at the expense of such a separation? Are they not innocent? It cannot be denied. But some who are as pious and good as ourselves think otherwise. If then they are indifferent, may they not be as innocently given up, as retained? They cannot certainly be wholly in the wrong, and we in the right. This, though a foolish conceit, is a prevailing mistake. —*Ibid. p.* 21.

BAPTISM.

BISHOP BURNET.

The excluding parents from sponsors, and requiring them to procure others, is extremely incon-

venient, and makes them to be a mockery rather than a sponsion in too many.—*Conclusion of his History.*

ARCHDEACON BLACKBURNE.

The office of sponsors, although ancient, is now for the most part become matter of mere form, and seldom if ever answereth the good purpose for which it was instituted; it is many times the occasion of offence, and doth more detriment than service to the church and religion.

REV. JOHN JONES,
Rector of Alconbury.

As to the abuse of this institution, it has been complained of by many. Dean Addison observes, that this pious custom is by many turned into an idle ceremony (*Primitive Institution, p.* 210.). Mr. Saywell says, that several irregularities have crept into the usage of sponsors, which appointment, as it is now often performed, is liable to cavil, and deformed by some indecencies which are directly contrary to the mind of the church. That once valuable institution is now so much degenerated as to become matter of scandal to Dissenters and of triumph to unbelievers, and of so little benefit to ourselves, as to make it doubtful whether it be worth retaining.—*Necessity of Catechizing, p.* 12, 13.

BISHOPS AND PRESBYTERS.

BISHOP BURNET.

The declaration made of the functions of Bishops and Priests, and signed by thirty-seven civilians and divines, among whom were thirteen Bishops, affirms that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees of distinction in orders, but only of Deacons and Ministers and of Priests and Bishops. The book entitled "The Institution of a Christian Man," subscribed by the clergy in convocation, and confirmed by Parliament, owns Bishops and Presbyters to be the same.

ARCHBISHOP USHER.

Presbyters and Bishops differed only in degree, and not in order; and in places where Bishops could not be procured, ordination of Presbyters was valid.

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

The judgement of Archbishop Cranmer, as quoted by Dr. Stillingfleet, was, that Bishops and Priests were at one time not two things, but one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion.—*Irenic. p.* 392.

BISHOP BILSON.

If this of Timothy and Titus fails (the power of Bishops to ordain), Bishops may claim their autho-

rity by custom of the church; but by any divine precept expressed in Scripture they cannot.—*Of the Perpetual Gov. of the Church, p.* 300.

BISHOP JEWEL.

In St. Jerome's time there were Metropolitans, Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and others. But Christ appointed not these distinctions of orders from the beginning. St. Jerome says, Let Bishops understand that they are in authority over Priests, more by custom, than by the order of God's truth. And St. Austin says, A Bishop is above the office of a Priest not by the authority of Scripture, but after the names of honour which the custom of the church hath now obtained.—*Jewel's Apology, p.* 2. *ch.* 3.

BISHOP ALLEY.

Before factions by the instinct of the Devil began in religion, the churches were governed by the common councils of Priests and Elders.—*Poor Man's Library, vol.* 1. *p.* 95, 96.

BISHOP PILKINGTON.

The power of order and jurisdiction which they prescribe to Bishops, *jure divino*, belong to all other Presbyters.—*Apol. Cathol.*

BISHOP HOOPER.

Look upon the Apostles chiefly, and upon all their successors for the space of four hundred years.

Though they had not so much upon their heads as our Bishops have, yet they had more within their heads, as the Scriptures and history testify. For they applied all their learning to the vocation and ministry of the church. The Bishops know that the primitive church had no such Bishops as now-a-days. If the fourth part of the bishopricks remained unto the Bishop, it were sufficient; the third part to such as should teach good learning, the second part to the poor of the diocess, and the other to maintain men-of-war for the safeguard of the nation,—it were better bestowed a great deal. For now it is ill-used, and bestowed for the greatest part on those who have no need of it.—*Upon the Commandments, p.* 78.

BURIAL SERVICE.

BISHOP HOADLY.

It must be owned, and it is too plain to be denied, that in such cases as men cut off by death in the midst of notorious sins, drunkenness, adultery, murder, &c., this office is wholly improper; and sure we need not doubt, but that at length some regard will be had to the repeated desires of many of the best defenders of the church, and this ground of objection against it wholly removed.—*Reasonableness of Conformity, p.* 62.

DR. BENNET.

It is plain from the whole tenour of the office, that it was never intended to be used at the burial of such persons as die in a state of notorious impenitence, without any appearance or profession of their return to God. So that those clergymen (if any such there be) who read this form at the funeral of the most profligate and debauched sinners, do not only act without authority, but against the manifest design of the church. I hope therefore that none of my brethren will ever prostitute this excellent service to the worst of purposes, to the encouragement of vice and the hardening of sinners, and that they will never change the whole of it into one continued and deliberate falsehood by so scandalous a misapplication. Some expressions in the office are inconsistent with the largest rational charity. The declaration of Archbishop Sancroft is well known. He owned to Dr. Tillotson, that he himself was so little satisfied with the burial office, that for that very reason he had never taken a cure of souls.—*Bennet, in Free and Candid Disquisitions, p.* 336, 337.

CHRIST THE SOLE LAWGIVER.

BISHOP HOADLY.

Christ himself is the sole lawgiver to his subjects, and himself the sole judge of their behaviour in the

affairs of conscience and eternal salvation. He hath in these points left behind him no vicegerents who can be said properly to supply his place, no interpreters upon whom his subjects may depend, no judges over the consciences or religion of his people. —*Sermon on Christ's Kingdom.*

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.

The pretence of the Romanists of a power in the church to define matters of faith is presumptuous and arrogant, being the highest degree of lording it over the Christian world.

CREEDS.

MR. MANNING.
Late Rector of Diss.

Let all Creeds be dismissed from our public worship, as unnecessary for those who assemble for the purpose of divine worship with avowed faith in Christ; of which faith it ought to be sufficient evidence, that they join in prayers and praises which are offered up to Almighty God in his name. Let the object of worship be expressed in those terms only which Christ and his Apostles authorised by their precepts and directions. This would bring us back to the original simplicity of addressing prayers for all blessings, and ascribing all glory, adoration, and praise, to the God and Father of all through our

Lord Jesus Christ. It would be needless then to revise the Articles. Let them gently sink into oblivion; or rather, as Dr. Gregory has said they will, let them long remain a monument of the extent of the weakness of the human understanding. We have only to forbear requiring subscription to them. —*Assize Sermons, p.* 185.

Dr. SYKES.

The growth of infidelity has been long the subject of great complaint among serious well-meaning people. May it not be worth while considering whether the true cause of infidelity does not lie amongst those who profess a faith which they call Christian, and which is found inconsistent with reason and even common sense? Every one who examines at all, will see additions made to the great articles of Christianity. How many additions were made to what the Gospel of Christ has said concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost in the several creeds found in the fourth century? And when men have seen things that they cannot comprehend or understand taught as fundamentals of Christianity, it is natural to reject what is unintelligible as impossible to be required by God; and thus must infidelity prevail. Whereas if one take the religion of Christ as it lies in the Word of God, it is pure, peaceable, noways contrary to reason, intelligible to everybody, so far as everybody is concerned.—*Enquiry when the Resurrection of the Body was inserted in the Creed, p.* 51.

BISHOP TAYLOR.

Bodies of confession and articles do much hurt by becoming instruments of separating and dividing communions, and making uncertain and unnecessary propositions a certain means of disunion.

BISHOP WATSON.

The Greek church admits into its ritual neither the Apostles' nor the Athanasian, but merely the Nicene Creed. The episcopal church in America admits the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, but rejects the Athanasian. The church of England admits the whole three into its liturgy, and some of the foreign churches admit none but the Apostles' Creed. These, and other creeds which might be mentioned, are all human fabrications.— *Watson's Life, p.* 244.

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON.

The account given of the Athanasian Creed seems no way satisfactory. I wish we were well rid of it. —*Life by Birch.*

BISHOP CLAYTON.

As to the Athanasian Creed, as that is a superstructure built on the foundation of the Nicene Creed, it is not only liable to all the objections which can be made against that, but has also many blemishes of its own to answer for, since it has not so much as the authority of a Council to support it, but is now a known forgery, detected by the criticisms of the

learned Vossius, and cannot be traced within two hundred years of the time of Athanasius.—*Speech in the House of Lords.*

BISHOP TAYLOR.

It is very hard to put uncharitableness into the Creed, and to make an article of faith, which perhaps was no faith of Athanasius, if we may believe Aquinas; nay, possibly the Creed is not his, it being written in Latin, which in all reason he did not.—*Discourse on Liberty of Prophecying.*

BISHOP TOMLINE.

I cannot but conceive it to be both unnecessary and presumptuous in any man to say, that except every one do keep it [the Catholic Faith] whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.—*Elements of Christian Theol. p.* 222.

That which is called the Athanasian Creed was certainly not written by this Father, nor is it found in his works. It was never heard of till the sixth century; it had never the sanction of any Council, and it is doubtful whether it was ever admitted into the Eastern churches. Great objections have been made to the clauses of this Creed which denounce eternal damnation against those who do not believe the catholic faith as here stated; and it certainly is to be lamented that assertions of so peremptory a nature have been used in any human composition. —*Ibid.*

In my judgement, notwithstanding the authority of former times, our church would have acted more wisely and more consistently with its general principles of mildness and toleration, if it had not adopted the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. —*Ibid. vol.* 2. *p.* 227, 228.

CHILLINGWORTH.

The damning sentences in the Athanasian Creed as we are made to subscribe it, are most false, and in a high degree presumptuous and schismatical, and therefore I cannot subscribe it to be agreeable to the Word of God, seeing I believe it to be repugnant to it.

The presumptuous imposing of the *senses* of *men* upon the words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences under the penalty of death and damnation; this vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God; this deifying our own interpretations, and tyrannous enforcing them upon others;—is and hath been the only fountain of all the schisms of the church, and that which makes them immortal, the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which tears in pieces, not the coat, but the bowels and members of Christ: *Ridente Turcâ, nec dolente Judæo.* Take away these walls of separation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this persecuting, burning, cursing, damning of men for not subscribing to the words of men as the words of God. Require of Christians only to believe in Christ, and to call no man master but

him only; let those leave claiming infallibility who have no claim to it; and let them that in their words disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their actions; in a word, take away tyranny, which is the Devil's instrument to support errors and superstitions and impieties which could not long withstand the power of truth; take away tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full liberty of captivating their understandings to Scripture only;—and, as rivers when they have a free passage run all to the ocean, so it may well be hoped, by God's blessing, that an universal liberty, thus moderated, may quickly reduce Christendom to truth and unity.—(*Chap.* 4. § 16.)

BISHOP WATSON.

Shew me, thou that judgest another man's servant so harshly, shew me in what part of the Bible men are commanded to worship one God in trinity and unity! The sanction is dreadful, the law should be plain. Produce the passage itself, and presume not by inference and argumentation, by metaphysical notions and scholastic distinctions and unscriptural phraseology, to damn, without doubt, all men for not believing as thou believest. I know the divine displeasure is in many places denounced against those who reject the Gospel when it has been offered them; but I deny that it is in any one place denounced against those who do not worship God in trinity and unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance.—*Considerations on the Liturgy and Articles, by a consistent Protestant.*

DR. CUDWORTH.

[The Creed commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius] was not written for a long time after Athanasius.

BISHOP BEDELL.

I will not easily believe that you can find in your hearts to count that man a dog and out of the church, and in a state of damnation, that steadfastly believeth in our Lord Jesus Christ, and confesseth all the doctrines of holy Scriptures, the sum whereof is in the creed that lastly with charitable affection embraceth all that hold this faith throughout the world, yea even that hate and persecute him to death. I do not take upon me to fore-judge you or any other, that doth not, with an evil mind and self-condemning conscience, only to maintain a faction, differ from that which I am persuaded is right. I account we hold the same faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To his judgement we stand or fall.—*Letter to Wadsworth,* 1620; *and Appendix to his Life, p.* 485.

DISSENTERS.

DR. EDWARDS.

If we will open our eyes, we should see that we are beholden to the Dissenters for the continuance

of a great part of our theological principles. For if the high churchmen had no checks they would have brought in Popery before this time. So that if there had been no Dissenters, the church of England had long since been ruined.—*Edwards' Preacher, vol.* 2. *p.* 153.

ARCHBISHOP SUTTON.

In the last debate on Lord Sidmouth's Bill, May 11th, 1811, this liberal prelate said, and with a fervour which bespoke sincerity, that "however he might lament what he conceived to be the errors of Protestant Dissenters, it was to be recollected the Bible was the foundation of their religious belief, as well as that of the established church, and was or might be in the hands of every member of the empire; and it was to be recollected also, that the best interpretations were but interpretations of men, and that the best of men are liable to error.

ESTABLISHMENTS.

BISHOP BATHURST.

If it could be proved (but I think it never will) that the worldly advantages of any particular establishment of Christianity cannot be maintained without an obvious violation on the part of its members

of the leading principles of the Christian religion, such, for instance, as that most excellent precept, "to do unto others, in all cases, as we would that they should do unto us", and that "new commandment to love one another"; if, I say, even the church of England cannot stand unless its members be called upon to act in direct opposition to these distinguishing precepts of our holy religion,—I for one should say, without the smallest hesitation, let it fall; for it must never be forgotten that our ecclesiastical establishment is no part of Christianity, but the *mode* only of propagating its doctrines, as has been accurately and justly remarked by Archdeacon Paley (*Moral Philosophy, B. VI. ch.* 10.). It seems then to follow, as a legitimate consequence, that this outward building, the mere fabric of the temple, would be hardly worth preserving, if that charity which is the guardian angel of the inner temple had taken its flight, and the glory was departed.—*Speech on the Catholic Bill,* 1824.

ARCHDEACON PALEY.

The authority therefore of a church-establishment is founded on its utility.—The single end we ought to propose [by different establishments] is the preservation and communication of religious knowledge. Every other idea and every other end that have been mixed with this,—as the making of the church an engine or even an ally of the state, converting it into the means of strengthening or of diffusing influence, or regarding it as a support of regal, in opposition to

popular forms of government,—have served only to debase the institution, and to introduce into it numerous corruptions and abuses.—*Moral Philosophy, B. VI. ch.* 10. (21*st Ed.*)

MR. FOSTER.
Rector of Colchester.

Religious establishments in general have been productive of more dismal effects to society and mankind than could possibly have arisen from an absolute disregard to religious opinion by the civil magistrate, and a total silence of the law upon that head.— *Visitat. Serm.* 1770.

ARCHDEACON BLACKBURNE.

As far as establishments are either necessary or expedient, they are necessary and expedient for every serious and sincere Christian. Can, then, those establishments be good, can they be righteous, which exclude from Christian privileges numbers of plain serious Christians, by prescribing conditions of communion which neither Christ nor his Apostles have authorised, or so much as mentioned?— *Four Discourses.*

FREE INQUIRY.

BISHOP CLAYTON.

Though it must be acknowledged that the reformation of the Protestant churches from Popery was

founded on the principle of the free use of reason in religious matters, and the freedom of inquiry into the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments has been generally allowed to be the right of every subject in the Protestant countries; yet it cannot be denied but that this freedom of inquiry is at the same time rendered ineffectual by those canons of the church which denounce excommunication to any who shall find fault with, or attempt to make any further reformation in those Articles which were established even so long ago as the time of Queen Elizabeth. So that although the *right* of free inquiry is generally acknowledged, yet there are such restraints laid upon the *exercise* of this right, as render it at the same time unsafe for any one to make use of it.—*Vindicat. of the Old and New Testament.*

BISHOP MARSH.

It is universally acknowledged, that as an historian ought to be of no party, an interpreter of Scripture should be of no sect. His only business is to inquire what the Apostles and Evangelists themselves intended to express. But instead of impartially examining the sacred writings with a view of discovering the truth, in whatever shape it may appear, we enter on the inquiry with a system already adopted, and have erected the edifice before the ground was explored on which it must be raised. It is from this cause that the Greek and Latin churches have discovered in the New Testament their different tenets. It is from this source that the church of

Rome derives her seven sacraments, the divine of the church of England her thirty-nine articles, the Lutheran his symbolic books, and the Calvinist his confession of faith.—*Essay on the Usefulness and Necessity of Theological Learning for those designed for Holy Orders.* 1792.

LITURGY.

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.

Forms of divine worship should be composed so as to be the least subject to any scruple from any person whatever; and were a review made by wise and peaceful men, not given to wrath or disputing, it might be so far from being a dishonour of the church, that it may add to the glory of it.—*Preface to Uneasiness of Separation.*

BISHOP WILKINS.

What one says of the counsel to be had from books, may be fitly applied to this of prayer by book, that it is commonly of itself something flat and dead, floating for the most part too much in generalities, and not particular for each several occasion. There is not that life and vigour to engage the affections as when it proceeds from the soul itself, and is the natural expression of those particulars whereof we

are most sensible. And if it be a fault not to strive after this gift, much more is it to jeer and despise it by the name of *extempore* prayer.—*Boyce's Rem. p.* 52, 53, 54.

JOHN HALES, *of Eton.*

Were liturgies and public forms of service so framed as that they admitted not of particular and private fancies, but contained only such things in which all Christians do agree, schisms in opinion were utterly banished. For consider of all liturgies that are or ever have been, and remove from them whatever is scandalous to any party, and leave nothing but what all agree on, and the event shall be that the public service and honour of God shall no longer suffer. Whereas to load our public forms with the private fancies upon which we differ, is the most sovereign way to perpetuate schism unto the world's end.—*On Schism: Works, vol.* 1. *p.* 126. *Glasgow Edit.*

CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

BISHOP WARBURTON.

A magistrate has no right to judge, as a magistrate, which is the true religion. This power cannot be given him, because one man cannot impower another

to judge for him in matters of religion. But a pretended regard for virtue and religion hath in all ages disposed the magistrate to deviate from his proper office; till at length the cure of the soul got the upper hand of that of the body in his administration, to the infinite danger of mankind in all his interests.—*Alliance,* 60, 101, 102.

No power of legislation can be admitted into Christ's church without making it a worldly kingdom.—*Ibid.*

BISHOP BATHURST.

Admitting for a moment the right of the civil government to interfere in the ecclesiastical discipline or doctrine of individuals dissenting from the established church,—a right which I was taught in early life to call in question by two of the greatest masters of reason whom this or any other country ever produced, I mean Locke and Hoadly,—&c. *Speech on the Catholic Question,* May 19th, 1817.

Rev. JAMES PENN.

The severities (*i.e.* for difference of opinion) mentioned, though countenanced and executed by the civil power, no arguments whatever can justify, palliate, or excuse: neither can ecclesiastics be justified in the eye of unprejudiced reason or pure religion, who shall, under any civil or religious penalty,

oblige men to approve of any articles of faith; because their faith may be right, and their morals pure, without them.—*Tracts, p.* 17.

ORDINATION.

BISHOP BURNET.

Certainly this answer, "I trust I am moved by the Holy Ghost", ought well to be considered; for if any say "I trust so," who yet know nothing of any such motion, and can give no account of it, he lies to the Holy Ghost, and makes his first approach to the altar with a lie in his mouth. . . . The motives that ought to determine a man to dedicate himself to the church, are a zeal for promoting the glory of God and for raising the honour of the Christian religion. This man, and only this man, so moved and qualified, can in truth say that he trusts he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost; and every one who ventures on the saying without this, is a sacrilegious profaner of the name of God.—*Pastoral Care, p.* 96, 99.

ORIGINAL SIN.

BISHOP TAYLOR.

The usual doctrines of Original Sin are made the great foundation of the horrible proposition con-

cerning absolute reprobation: the consequences of it reproach God with injustice; they charge God foolishly, and deny his goodness and his wisdom in many instances: and whatsoever can, upon the account of the divine attributes, be objected against the fierce way of absolute decrees, all that can be brought for the reproof of their usual propositions concerning original sin. For the consequences are plain; and by them the necessity of my doctrine, and its usefulness, may be understood.

For, 1. If God decrees us to be born sinners, then he makes us be sinners; and then where is his goodness?

2. If God does damn any for that, he damns us for what we could not help, and for what himself did; and then where is his justice?

3. If God sentence us to that damnation which he cannot in justice inflict, where is his wisdom?

4. If God, for the sin of Adam, brings upon us a necessity of sinning; where is our liberty? where is our nature? what is become of all laws, and of all virtue and vice? how can men be distinguished from beasts? or the virtuous from the vicious?

5. If, by the fall of Adam, we are so wholly ruined in our faculties, that we cannot do any good, but must do evil; how shall any man take care of his ways? or how can it be supposed he should strive against all vice, when he can excuse so much upon his nature? or indeed how shall he strive at all? For if all actual sins are derived from the original, and which is unavoidable, and yet an irresistible cause, then no man can take care to avoid any

actual sin, whose cause is natural, and not to be declined. And then where is his providence and government?

6. If God does cast infants into hell for the sin of others, and yet did not condemn devils but for their own sin; where is his love to mankind?

7. If God chooseth the death of so many millions of persons who are no sinners upon their own stock, and yet swears that he does not love the death of a sinner, viz. sinning with his own choice; how can it be credible, that he should love to kill innocents, and yet should love to spare the criminal? Where then is his mercy, and where is his truth?

8. If God hath given us a nature by derivation, which is wholly corrupted, then how can it be, that all which God made is good? For though Adam corrupted himself, yet in propriety of speaking, we did not; but this was the decree of God; and then where is the excellency of his providence and power? where is the glory of the creation?—*Works, vol.* 9. 8*vo. p.* 344.

BISHOP CLAYTON.

Original Sin is a contradiction in terms: for as the word *sin* implies an act of the will, so the word *original* implies the direct contrary, and supposes the criminal act to have been committed by another person, to which act that person, to whom the sin is imputed, neither contributed by thought, word, or deed.—*Thoughts on Self-love, Innate Ideas, &c. p.* 17.

DR. THOMAS BURNET.

Sed veniet dies, cum non minus absurda habebitur et odiosa hæc opinio quam transubstantiatio hodie. —*De Statu Mortuorum, p.* 330.

SCHISM.

BISHOP TAYLOR.

Few churches that have framed bodies of confession and articles, will endure any person that is not of the same confession; which is a plain demonstration that such bodies of confession and articles do much hurt, by becoming instruments of separating and dividing communions, and making unnecessary or uncertain propositions a certain means of schism and disunion. But then men would do well to consider whether or not such proceedings do not derive the guilt of schism upon those who least think of it: and whether of the two is the greatest schismatic, he that makes unnecessary and inconvenient impositions, or he that disobeys them, because he cannot, without doing violence to his conscience, believe them? he that parts communion because he cannot, without sin, entertain it? or they that have made it necessary for him to separate, requiring such conditions which to no man are simply

necessary, or to him in particular are sinful or impossible?—*Liberty of Prophecying, sect.* 22.

JOHN HALES, *of Eton.*

If the spiritual guides and fathers of the church would be a little more sparing of encumbering churches with superfluities, and not over-rigid in reviving obsolete customs or imposing new, there would be far less danger of schism or superstition. Meanwhile, wheresoever false or suspected opinions are made a piece of church liturgy, he who separates is not schismatic, but he who imposes.—*Tracts, p.* 182.

DEAN PRIDEAUX.

The Romanists do not believe their liturgy was brought from heaven, though they stick to it as if it were; and if that stiffness of humour, which is now among us, against altering any thing in our liturgy should continue, it must at last bring us to the same pass; for all languages being *in fluxu*, should our liturgy be still continued without any change or alteration, it would at length be as much an *unknown* tongue, as now the Roman service is to the vulgar of that communion.—*Connection, P.* 2. *p.* 218. 8*vo.*

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

Another church may separate from Rome, if Rome will separate from Christ; and so far as it separates from him and the faith, so far another church may separate from it. The cause of the separation is

yours, for you thrust us from you, because we called for truth and redress of abuses; for a schism must needs be theirs whose the cause of it is. The woe runs full out of the mouth of Christ even against him that gives the offence, not against him that takes it. He makes the separation who gives the first cause of it, not he that makes an actual separation from a just cause proceeding.—*Conference with a Jesuit.*

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.

When a church requires unnecessary conditions of communion, then that church must take on itself the charge of schism. Let men turn and wind themselves which way they will, by the very same arguments that any will prove separation from the church of Rome to be lawful, because she requires unlawful things as conditions of her communion, it will be proved lawful not to conform to any suspected or unlawful practice required by any church government upon the same terms, if the thing so required be, by a serious and sober inquiry, judged unwarrantable by a man's own conscience. The duties Christ required of his disciples were none but such as were necessary. He that came to take away the insupportable yoke of Jewish ceremonies, certainly did never intend to gall the necks of his disciples with another instead of it. And it would be strange that the church should require more than Christ himself did, and make other conditions of her communion than our Saviour did of discipleship. How

will they answer it at the great day, for keeping them out of their communion by such things as they call indifferent?—*Irenicum, p.* 199.

BISHOP SHIPLEY.

I shall end what I propose to say with observing, that the ruling party is always liberal in bestowing the title of schismatics and heretics on those who differ from them in matters of religion, and representing them as dangerous to the state. My lords, the contrary is the truth. Those who are uppermost and have the power are the men that do the mischief; the schismatics only suffer, and complain, and are often thought worthy of punishment for that reason. I am not afraid of those tender consciences who are over-cautious of professing or believing too much; if they are *sincerely* in the wrong, I forgive their error and respect their integrity. The men I am afraid of are the men who believe every thing, and subscribe every thing, and who vote for every thing.—*Speech on the Repeal of Penal Laws against Dissenters.*

CHILLINGWORTH.

Neither is it always of necessity schismatical to separate from the external communion of a church, though wanting nothing necessary. For if this church, supposing it to want nothing necessary, require me to profess, against my conscience, that I believe some error, though never so small and innocent, which I do not believe, and will not allow me her commu-

nion but upon that condition,—in this case the church requiring this condition is schismatical, and not I for separating from the church.—*Preface to his Reply to the author of Charity Maintained.*

ARCHDEACON PALEY.

Keeping people out of churches who might be admitted consistently with every end of public worship, and excluding men from communion who desire to embrace it upon the terms that God prescribes, is certainly not encouraging, but rather causing men to forsake the assembling of themselves together. It is not giving truth a fair chance, to decide points at one certain time, and by one set of men, which had much better be left to the successive inquiries of different ages and different people.—*Evidences, p.* 41, 42.

Rev. JAMES PENN.

To occasion a schism in the church of Christ is certainly criminal: but whom are we to look upon as the authors? who are the aggressors? who hath the best claim to the title of the Church of Christ? Both parties endeavour to exculpate themselves, and they are to be commended for it; but not for reflecting upon each other. In this they are to be blamed. May not both be innocently in the wrong; and neither he that conforms, nor he that dissents, be guilty of sin? Our manner of worship, if not contrary to, is not to be found in the New Testament. It was copied from the practices of that impure

Christian church, the church of Rome. Though they may be greatly purged from their abuses, there seems to be too near a resemblance in the use of some things to their original superstition, which on that account are offensive to them. In many things we shall find the arguments for retaining or rejecting rites and ceremonies to be of equal force and weight, and to have the approbation and confirmation of the Scriptures. As men, they, as well as we, have an unquestionable right to judge for themselves, and to dispose of their own conscience; and Christianity supports this right, by giving to them such a power. "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God." If their opinions are false, as ignorance may be the cause, and conscience the motive for embracing them, they are excusable, being guilty of no sin: for where no knowledge is, there can be no sin. According to St. James, "To him only that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is a sin." And according to St. Paul, he who conforms to, believes in, or practises any thing, though in itself indifferent and of no obligation, which he judges to be wrong, or is in his own mind so persuaded, commits a sin. "Whatever is not of faith," saith he, "is sin." Let us not then judge our brother's conscience, but take care rightly to inform our own; not expecting that he should comply with us in doing what he should not do, and what, both in reason and Scripture, he would be condemned for doing.—*Tracts, p.* 24.

SUFFICIENCY OF SCRIPTURE.

BISHOP JEWEL.

We receive and embrace all the canonical Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. In them only, God hath revealed his will to us. In them only can the mind of man acquiesce. In them all that is necessary to salvation is abundantly and plainly contained, by which all ecclesiastical doctrines ought to be tried. No law, no tradition, no custom is to be received or continued, if it is contrary to Scripture, though St. Paul himself or an angel from heaven should come and teach otherwise.—*Latin Apology, sect.* 27.

NEW TRANSLATION.

DR. G. CLARKE,
Vicar of Great Waltham, Essex.

While evidences are continually produced, as numerous as manuscripts brought to light by the industry of editors, and although for nearly a century a new translation of the Bible has been impatiently solicited by the learned of these countries, by Bishops Lowth and Newcome, by Kennicott, Blayney and others, a parochial minister is still obliged to read psalms and lessons in translations which fre-

quently mock and deride his knowledge of the original, disgust him with their absurdity, inadequacy and impropriety, and confuse him with shame for his church, from a consciousness of their being unintelligible to his congregation, and scarcely less so to himself.—*Sermon on the Fast*, 1808.

BISHOP LOWTH.

Whenever it shall be thought proper to set forth the Holy Scriptures, for the public use of our churches, to better advantage than as they appear in the present English translation, the expediency of which grows every day more evident, a revision or correction of that translation may perhaps be more advisable than to attempt an entire new one. For as to style and language it admits but of little improvement, but in respect of the sense and accuracy of interpretation, the improvements of which it is capable are great and numberless.—*Lowth's Isaiah, Prelim. Disc. p.* 72.

ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME.

One design in engaging in the present arduous province was to recommend and facilitate an improved English version of the Scriptures, than which nothing can be more beneficial to the cause of religion, or more honourable to the reign and age in which it was patronized and executed. The reason for its expediency is the mistakes, imperfections, and many invincible obscurities of our present Version ; the accession of various helps since the exe-

cution of that work; the advanced state of learning; and our emancipation from slavery to the Masoretic points, and to the Hebrew text as absolutely incorrupt.—*Historical View, &c.*

BISHOP MARSH.

As this collation [viz. of the Bishops' Bible, the preceding English Versions, and the original,] was made by some of the most distinguished scholars in the age of James the First, it is probable that our authorised Version is as faithful a representation of the original Scriptures as *could have been formed at that period.* But when we consider the immense accession which has been *since* made, both to our critical and to our philological apparatus, when we consider that the whole mass of literature, commencing with the London Polyglott and continued to Griesbach's Greek Testament, was collected *subsequently* to that period; when we consider that the most important sources of intelligence for the *interpretation* of the original Scriptures was likewise opened after that period, we cannot possibly pretend that our authorised Version does not require *amendment.* On this subject we need only refer to the work of Archbishop Newcome, entitled, "An Historical View of the English Biblical Translations; the Expediency of revising by authority our present English Translation; and the means of executing such a Revision." Indeed Dr. Macknight, in the second section of his General Preface, goes so far as to say of our authorised Version, "It is by no means such a

just representation of the inspired originals, as merits to be implicitly relied on, for determining the controverted articles of the Christian faith, and for quieting the dissensions which have rent the church. —*Theological Lectures, Part III. p.* 35.

In recommending a revision of the authorised Version, I have the satisfaction to agree with Archbishop Secker, Archbishop Newcome, Bishop Lowth, Dr. Waterland, Dr. Kennicott, Dr. White (Professor of Oxford), and many other eminent divines of the established church."—*Ibid. Two Lectures on the History of Biblical Interpretation, App. p.* 52, *note.*

TITHES.

MR. DAWSON,
Rector of Rinfield.

No argument can be drawn for the obligatory nature of tithes in a Christian state and church, either from their having obtained among the Hebrews and the worshipers of the true God before the law of Moses, for the practice of sacrificing animals obtained likewise; nor from the Levitical dispensation, which was merely local and temporary. (Gen. xiv. 20. &c.) "And he gave him tithes of all," should have been translated, "And he would have given him riches of all he had." Melchisedeck, not Abraham, was the donor. If in this passage "massr" denotes the tenth part, it will not be easy to assign

a sufficient reason for supposing Abraham to have given the king of Salem the tenth of the spoil, rather than the king of Salem to have given to Abraham the tenth part of the riches which he brought along with him. Besides, may not Abraham be deemed a priest with as great propriety as the king of Salem? Do we not read of Abraham's building an altar at Jerusalem?—*Translation of Genesis.*

TOLERATION.

BISHOP KENNET.

The bishop said he would not allow the Bill (of Toleration) to be against the interests of the church, for it tended to its advantage and security. He had observed from history that the church most flourished when clergymen did not affect more power than came to their share, and were tender of the liberties of their fellow-subjects. "The church in danger" was a cry uttered with sinister designs. The words were misused, and made a mighty noise in the mouths of women and children. In his opinion the church of England, which he defined to be a Scriptural institution, was founded upon a rock, and could not be in danger so long as it enjoyed the light of the Gospel and our excellent constitution.—*Speech of Lord John Russell on the Test and Corporation Acts, Feb.* 26, 1828.

MR. TATE,

Fellow of Sidney College, and Rector of Marske.

Free and complete toleration does not punish, does not degrade, does not disfranchise the member of another religious body, because the conscience will not let them join the worship of the established religion. Perfect toleration ensures to all Christians, without consideration of sect or creed, the full enjoyment, as good subjects, of all rights civil and political. And whenever the church and state of England shall agree to grant the boon of such a toleration, the state will rest on a basis of adamant, and the church, even beyond its present excellence and glory, will become the most benevolent and apostolical church in Christendom.—*Assize Sermon at York*, 1825.

UNIFORMITY.

BISHOP CLAYTON.

I apprehend any attempt towards avoiding diversity of opinion not only to be useless, but an impracticable scheme. I do not only doubt whether the compilers of the Articles, but whether any two thinking men ever agreed exactly in their opinion, not only with regard to all the Articles, but even with regard to any one of them.—*Essay on Spirit, Introduction.*

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET.

Without all controversy, the main inlet of distraction, confusion, and divisions of the Christian world, have been other conditions of church communion than Christ hath made. Would there ever be less peace and unity in the church, if a diversity were allowed as to practices supposed to be indifferent? Yea, there would be much more if there were a mutual forbearance and condescension as to such things. The unity of the church is a unity of love and affection, and not a bare uniformity of practice and opinion.—*Irenicum, ch.* 8.

Were we but so happy as to take off all things granted unnecessary by all, and suspected by many, and judged unlawful by some, and to make nothing the bonds of our communion but what Christ has done, one faith, one baptism, &c., allowing a liberty for matters of indifferency, and bearing with the weakness of those who cannot bear things which others count lawful,—we might indeed be restored to a true primitive lustre far sooner than by furbishing up some antiquated ceremonies, that can derive their origin no higher than ancient custom and tradition. God will one day convince men, that the unity of the church lies more in the unity of faith and affection than in the uniformity of doubtful rites and ceremonies.—*Irenicum, ch.* 8.

DR. G. CLARKE.

The great offence (Luke xvii. 1.) which in all nations and in all ages has hindered the propagation

of the Gospel of truth, has been an hypocritical zeal to secure by force a fictitious uniformity of opinions, which is indeed impossible in nature, instead of the real Christian unity of sincerity, charity, and mutual forbearance, which is the bond of perfectness. . . . . Let us not sow divisions by endeavouring to impose upon each other in matters of faith, and by lording over the heritage of God. Let us not, by departing from the unerring rule of reason and Scripture, corrupt the plain and beautiful doctrine of Christ; but endeavour to keep it in that original simplicity, wherein he has delivered it in such a manner as to be level to the capacity of the meanest understanding.—*Sermons, vol.* 6. *No.* 18.

Dr. GRISDALE.
Chaplain to George III.

Respect is due even to the weaknesses and the mistakes of the human mind. There is so much uncertainty in things, such a difference in the size of our understandings, in our habits of thinking, our modes of life and education, that it is impossible our judgements should be exactly alike. The advantages of permitting men freely to discuss speculative points, and to form their own tenets thereupon, greatly preponderate over the inconveniences. By exercising the privilege of thinking for ourselves, and of debating with one another the truth or falsehood of a proposition, we expand and improve our mental powers; and though, perhaps, we may sometimes dwell more than might be wished on questions dubious and obscure; yet by these exercises the

mind unavoidably grows more acute, and consequently more capable of discerning the force of moral obligations. Vain is the pretence of bringing all Christians to a perfect uniformity of sentiment or practice in matters of religion: this could not be obtained even in the apostolical days, nor can it be hoped for till we come to heaven.—*Sermon at the Consecration of Bishop Douglas*, 1788.

UNITARIANISM.

BISHOP WATSON.

If different men, in carefully and conscientiously examining the Scriptures, should arrive at different conclusions, even on points of the last importance, we trust God will be merciful to him that is in error. We trust that he will pardon the Unitarian if he be in error, because he has fallen into it from a dread of becoming an idolater, and giving that glory to another which he conceives to be due to God alone. If the worshipper of Jesus Christ be in an error, we trust God will pardon his mistake, because he has fallen into it from a dread of disobeying what he conceives to be revealed concerning the honour to be given him. Both are actuated by the same principle,—the fear of God; and though that principle impels them into different roads, it is our hope and belief, that if they add to their faith charity, they will meet in heaven.—*Tracts, vol.* 1. *Pref. p.* 17.

[Rev. W. MANNING.
Rector of Diss.

The seeds of the doctrine of the Trinity, that is, hints which would serve for a foundation whereon that doctrine might be built, were sown by Plato among his followers. . . . . Let it be observed also, that the most learned among the early converts (to Christianity) were educated in the schools of the Platonists. We must thus account for some passages in the history of revelation in conformity with Platonic notions. And no one passage of that history appears more obviously to have originated from hence, than the beginning of St. John's Gospel. Let any man open the Greek Testament and the Septuagint version together, and compare the beginning of St. John's Gospel with the beginning of Genesis; and a very little skill in the Greek language will enable him to see the one is a Platonic paraphrase of the other. . . . . It is undoubtedly highly reasonable that we pay great deference to a sacred historian; but how can we help surmising that he has christianized the Philonic Platonism which then prevailed? And under the persuasion that this is *possible*, ought we not to be exceedingly cautious how we perplex the Christian world with a doctrine deduced from it, as an article of faith; and solicitous that the expressions of it or indeed any allusions to it should not continue to be inserted in the public forms of devotion, to the great embarrassment of many faithful and thinking Christians? Many wise and good men, with whose religious opinions these doctrines are irreconcileable, but who are equally sincere

in the profession of Christianity, and equally punctual in the discharge of the duties of it, with those to whose theological principles these myterious tenets are perfectly agreeable, have conceived the Evangelist adopted these Platonic terms, only by way of *accommodation*, without any idea of violating the divine Unity; and it may be urged in their favour, that the idea of a Trinity was not then matured. But be that as it may; it is much to be wished that all parties were allowed to enjoy their respective opinions of this matter in tranquillity and with *credit;* for the utmost latitude on this subject is perfectly compatible with the profession, the privileges, and the hopes of Christianity.—*Notes to Assize Sermons, p.* 122—130.

WORSHIP.

ARCHBISHOP WAKE.

The Lord's Prayer teaches us that we should pray to God only, and to him as our Father, through Jesus Christ our Lord.—*Clarke's Script. Doct. p.* 435.

BISHOP BULL.

In the first and best ages the church of Christ directed all their prayers to God only...through the mediation of Jesus Christ.—*Answer to a Query of the Bishop of Meaux, in Clarke's Scriptural Doctrine,* 435.

BISHOP HALL.

It is a dangerous thing to make innovations, if but in the circumstances of God's worship: these human additions, which would seem to grace the institution of God, deprave it; the foolishness of God is wiser than man.—*Contempl. L.* 20. *p.* 1086.

ARCHDEACON PALEY.

The question concerning the object of worship is attended, I confess, with difficulty. It seems almost directly to divide the worshippers. But let the church pare down her excrescences till she comes to this question; let her discharge from her liturgy controversies unconnected with devotion; let her try what may be done for all sides, by worshipping God in that generality of expression in which He has left some points; let her recall the terrors suspended over freedom of inquiry; let the toleration she allows to Dissenters be made absolute; let her invite men to search the Scriptures; let her governors encourage the studious and learned of all persuasions;—let her do this, and she will be secure of the thanks of her clergy, and, what is more, of their sincerity.—*Tracts, p.* 37.

THE END.

PRINTED BY RICHARD TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

REVIEW

OF

DR. J. P. SMITH'S

SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH.

A

REVIEW

OF

Dr. J. P. SMITH'S

SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH.

(FROM THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY FOR 1831.)

LONDON:

REPRINTED FOR AND SOLD BY THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION, 3, WALBROOK BUILDINGS, WALBROOK; SOLD ALSO BY R. HUNTER, 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD.

1832.

PRINTED BY G. SMALLFIELD, HACKNEY.

ON

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Dr. J. P. Smith's "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah," is a work which has attained to the highest reputation, not only within the pale of the particular sect to which the author belongs, but amongst all classes of believers in the doctrines of reputed orthodoxy. It is certainly to be ranked amongst the ablest defences of those doctrines which have ever appeared. Learned, ingenious, and laborious, it deserves the attention of all who are interested in the great controversy to which it relates: and if the irresistible tendency of the system he defends, and the perverting prejudices to which it gives occasion, have led the author often to treat his opponents with great real injustice, there are also indications of kind feelings, and of a desire to act towards them with candour and Christian meekness, which may with many persons give more weight to his censures, rendering them, when founded in error or misrepresentation, more dangerous, if not more offensive.

It has been a special object with Dr. Smith to furnish a reply to the "Calm Inquiry" of Mr. Belsham, and it is in reference more particularly (though by no means exclusively) to this object, that we now propose to examine his volumes—not that we would hold up Mr. Belsham's work as faultless either in plan or execution—not, certainly, that we consider the great body of Christians who adopt the sentiments he defends, as answerable for the mistakes into which he may have fallen or the improper spirit which he is accused of having manifested—but his work being honestly esteemed by us an able and satisfactory treatise on a very important subject, written under the influence of an enlightened, disinterested, and impartial love of truth; and the effect it has produced upon the minds of many intel-

ligent and sincere inquirers being well known to us, we were anxious to satisfy ourselves respecting a laboured attack upon it coming from an individual who stands so high both as to character and attainments as Dr. Smith: and having long since fully satisfied ourselves, we think it seasonable at this time, when our venerated friend has been taken from among us, and his work, in consequence of the very small number of copies remaining, may perhaps for the present have its circulation somewhat restrained, to call the attention of our readers to the true state of the controversy, and assist them in judging how far Dr. Smith has succeeded in invalidating Mr. Belsham's arguments, or in otherwise defending the prevailing doctrine respecting the person of our Lord.

Dr. Smith's work is divided into four books, of which the first is occupied with preliminary considerations; the second is "On the Information to be obtained concerning the Person of the Messiah from the Prophetic Descriptions of the Old Testament;" the third, "On the Information to be obtained concerning the Person of the Christ from the Narratives of the Evangelical History, and from our Lord's own Assertions and Intimations;" and the fourth, "On the Doctrine taught by the Apostles in their Inspired Ministry concerning the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ." This distribution of the subject may probably be the most natural and useful for the impartial student, who, as he meets with each passage which may have a possible bearing on the point he is investigating, will refer to lexicographers, scholiasts, and commentators, without distinction of party or opinion, and having obtained all the aids he can, will form his own independent judgment. But where the object proposed is to set before our readers the *results* of our inquiries, and to compare these results with those obtained by others, we cannot help thinking that such an arrangement as Mr. Belsham's (who collects and examines in order the texts which have been adduced in support of each point of disputed doctrine) is more clear and satisfactory, as well as more favourable to conciseness. We do not think it the best method for the instruction of students, yet we were hardly prepared for the following remarks from any one possessing the least share of judgment or candour:

"The selection and arrangement of texts was certainly, so far as it went, a suitable means; provided a due regard were had to the studying of each in its proper place and connexion. But to throw down before a company of inexperienced youths a regular set of rival and discordant expositions, 'in general without any additional, or at least doctrinal, comment of the compiler's own,' appears to me to have been a method not well calculated to lead into the path of convincing evidence and well-ascertained truth. It might excite party feeling, wordy disputation, unholy levity, and rash decision: but so far as either from the theory of the case or from experience I am able to form a judgment, I could not expect a better result, except in rare instances indeed."—Scripture Testimony, Vol. I. Chap. vi. p. 160, second edition.

On what grounds is it here insinuated that, under Mr. Belsham's guidance, a *due regard was not had to the connexion of texts*, in defiance of his own rule on the subject: "In order to judge of the true sense of a disputed text, it is necessary to consider the connexion in which it stands"? (Calm Inquiry, Introd. p. 3, 2d ed.) So long as important passages of Scripture are differently understood by men of learning, who are able each to give some plausible reasons in favour of his own interpretation, what can the honest and impartial instructor do but lay before his pupils, or, in Dr. S.'s phraseology, "throw down before a company of inexperienced youths,"

a set of rival and discordant expositions? Or how would this be avoided by changing the plan of treating the subject from Mr. B.'s to Dr. Smith's, or to any other that may be suggested? A theological lecturer is certainly not bound to suppress the expression of his own opinions in his class; and provided that his pupils are prepared not to be the passive recipients of his sentiments, but to reflect on all that is laid before them, and draw conclusions for themselves, it is reasonable and natural that they should have the benefit of his thoughts on the subject before them, as well as those of others: but whilst he faithfully executes the duty of opening to them the existing sources of information, his own opinion cannot be essential, and there may be circumstances in which it is much better for him not to bring it forward at all. If Mr. Belsham had added doctrinal comments of his own, we may be sure that he would now be accused of having attempted unduly to bias the minds of his pupils. If the fair statement of whatever has been said most important on each side of a disputed question, be not "a method well calculated to lead into the path of convincing evidence and well-ascertained truth," we must presume that the plan preferred is making known only what has been said on one side; or, if they cannot be concealed, accompanying the arguments on the other side with such depreciating comments as may effectually prevent their receiving any real attention. Why the demand for profound and impartial thought on the most important topics of human inquiry, that which might be supposed to have, of all possible employments, most tendency to sober the mind and impress it with a feeling of solemn responsibility, should be judged likely to excite "party feeling, wordy disputation, unholy levity, and rash decision," is what we cannot understand, nor can we conceive how the *prerequisites* for the successful study of the Scriptures demanded by Dr. Smith in the passage immediately following that which we have quoted, should appear to him to be opposed to the views of his rival, or to be any thing different from what every theological instructor, whatever might be his peculiar opinions, must desire to find amongst those whose studies he is called upon to direct.

Guided by the arrangement of Dr. Smith's work, we shall now apply ourselves to notice such portions of it as the limits within which this article must necessarily be confined, will allow us to select for animadversion; and we must begin by exposing the sophistry of the first chapter, entitled, "On the Evidence proper to this Inquiry:"

"We cannot," says Dr. S., "reasonably doubt of the UNITY of God, in every sense in which unity is a perfection: but to the exact determination of that sense we are not competent. A manifest unity of intelligence, design, and active power, does not warrant the inference that *unity* in all respects, without modification, is to be attributed to the *Deity*. For any thing that we know, or are entitled to presume, there may be a sense of the term *unity* which implies restriction, and would be incompatible with the possession of all possible perfection."—P. 10.

We ascribe *unity* to the Deity. Unity is a word—a significant sound—a sound significant (like all words) only from the power of association, and having no sense inherent in itself which may remain unknown to those acquainted with its ordinary usage. It is not like many words, the notions corresponding to which in different minds are very different: on the contrary, the meaning it conveys, on all other subjects besides the one now under consideration, is definite, clear, and universally agreed upon. Why then do we employ it upon this subject? Either our meaning is the same as when we apply the same term to other subjects, or we use the word in a

loose sense to express some resemblance or approximation to the usual one, or we use it without any distinct meaning at all. It is very possible to use a word without meaning, as part of a formula which we have been early taught, and which, without having been reflected upon, is associated, as a whole, with certain notions of sanctity and duty; but we manifestly cannot so use a word as the result of our own observations or inquiries: it cannot, therefore, be in this manner that we ascribe unity to the Deity from the study of his works. Neither is it in the loose sense, for when we reason from unity of intelligence, design, and active power, to unity of mind, and therefore of being, the argument may or may not be conclusive; but it has no meaning, no existence whatever, if we change the sense of the term. It is plain, then, that the unity of the Deity, as a doctrine of *natural religion*, (whether established by sufficient evidence or not,) is unity in the obvious sense of the term, and is opposed to plurality of persons, hypostases, or distinctions, of whatsoever kind, in the Divine Nature.

After some farther argument on our ignorance of the essence and mode of existence of the Deity, Dr. Smith proceeds to say,

"These remarks have been made with a view to shew that there is *no antecedent incredibility* in the supposition, that the infinite and unknown essence of the Deity *may* comprise a plurality—not of separate beings—but of hypostases, subsistencies, persons; or, since many wise and good men deem it safest and most becoming to use no specific term for this ineffable subject,—of distinctions; always remembering that such distinctions alter not the unity of the Divine Nature For any thing that we know, or have a right to assume, this may be one of the *unique* properties of the Divine Essence; a necessary part of that Sole Perfection which must include every real, every possible excellence; a circumstance peculiar to the Deity, and distinguishing the mode of His existence from that of the existence of all dependent beings."

Now we have shewn that so far as the argument *from Nature* for the Divine Unity is good for any thing, (we will not press it as conclusive,) it is an argument for Unity, in the obvious and usual sense of that term, excluding and opposed to all plurality. No one can say that any appearance of Nature sanctions the doctrine which is contended for; and from the philosopher to the savage, no one possessing the use of his reason, ever heard it proposed for the first time, or first applied himself to study it, without feelings of surprise and of repugnance. It is hardly then too much to say, that there must exist in every unprejudiced mind a *justifiable indisposition* towards its reception— an indisposition which may indeed be overcome by evidence, but which must require to overcome it evidence *clear*, *direct*, *consistent*, and *abundant*. We are called upon to admit this notion of plurality in unity on the authority of *revelation*, whilst, inconsistently enough, we are told in the same breath that it cannot be understood. It is represented that we may conceive it *possible* that there *may be* a sense of the term *Unity* consistent with such plurality as exists in the Divine Nature, though the term Unity is an arbitrary sign, unmeaning, except as it excites by association a certain notion in the minds of those who hear it; and the notion which it thus represents is, with equal correctness, represented by the phrase "absence of plurality;" that is to say, we might as consistently affirm existence and non-existence of the same thing, at the same time, as unity and plurality: yet every attempt at rendering the ideas at all compatible is proscribed as heresy. We cannot even know what to call the distinctions in the Divine Nature: if we use the common term persons, we must consider that term as having a

special but inexplicable sense; if we substitute any other word, we must equally remember that it is the sign of an idea, never possessed by any human mind, and is to us an unmeaning sound, or only reminds us at most of the existence of a mystery which we can never hope to penetrate. All this of a doctrine *of revelation*, a doctrine *revealed*, i. e. made known. *What* made known? Is it the necessity of using a certain form of words? Even thus the principal orthodox terms are not Scriptural—but no! prescription of words is not revelation. There must be something for the understanding to embrace, and by meditation on which the practical benefits of *truth* or knowledge may be obtained. It is senseless to talk of that being revealed, which does not even remain unintelligible, but in respect to which we are obliged to substitute language which excites inconsistent and utterly irreconcilable ideas for the confession of ignorance. It is vain to refer us to the mysteries of Nature and Providence, and the incomprehensibility of all the Divine perfections. We are, indeed, blind and feeble-minded, and it would be strange if finite beings could fully comprehend the attributes or works of Him who is infinite; but on all these subjects what we think that we know is intelligible and practically useful, what remains mysterious is so confessedly, and does not mock us with the pretence of being revealed in language which is either unmeaning or contradictory.

It cannot then be thought unreasonable to insist that there *is* a strong *antecedent improbability* attending the doctrine of the Trinity. For our own parts, so completely are we convinced of the sufficiency of the evidence for the Jewish and Christian revelations, and so deeply are we impressed with a sense of the importance of these dispensations to mankind, that whatever is proved from the records to be a genuine part of them we will submissively receive, and if we cannot understand it, we will believe that our *profession* of it is to do some good; but we neither can nor ought to resist the feeling that peculiarly strong and clear evidence is necessary to support a doctrine such as this: nor, if persons who were fully satisfied that no trace of it is to be found in the records of the Divine communications have spoken of its absurdity and utter impossibility, can such language with any appearance of justice be attributed to impiety or contempt of revelation. We do not, however, justify such language; what we have said has been merely in reply to Dr. Smith's attempt to set aside all antecedent improbability. We are persuaded that Unitarian Christians act most wisely in meeting the question simply as a Scriptural question. Other views of the subject may appear to them very striking, but they acknowledge the Sacred Records as the guides of their faith, and, firmly convinced that the Trinity is not taught or implied in them, they are anxious, in the first place, fairly and candidly to discuss that point with those who maintain the contrary position.

The next passage upon which we feel ourselves compelled to remark, and which is an example of the treatment Mr. Belsham uniformly receives from Dr. Smith, is the note (A) to Chapter III. which we must quote at length:

"No writer can be more prompt to appeal to the original text than the author of the *Calm Inquiry*; and for this, when reason and truth warrant the appeal, let him be commended. But a case happens in which the error of the Authorized Version affords a semblance of support to the Unitarian cause: and then he can argue from the *very inaccuracy* of the translation, with as comfortable a confidence as could be felt by the most illiterate of those lay-preachers, upon whom, on another occasion, he has poured unsparing contempt. (See a Letter to Lord Sidmouth, by the Rev. Thomas Belsham, 1811.) This case is one in which, with a view to neutralize the passage, 'In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,' (Col. ii. 9,) he brings an

alleged instance of the application of similar language to Christians generally: 'In the Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. iii 19, the Apostle prays that they *may be filled with all the fulness of God*, i. e. with knowledge of the Divine will, and conformity to the Divine image.' P. 252.—But the Apostle's expression is, 'that ye may be filled *unto* all the fulness of God;' suggesting the sublime conception of an approximation to the Supreme perfection, which is begun by religion now, and shall be ever growing in the holiness and bliss of the future state; while the infinity of distance must for ever remain between Deity and the creature. This palpable error is retained in the text of the 'Improved Version,' and the true rendering is barely mentioned in a note with this vapid and silly interpretation—i. e. 'that ye may be admitted into the Christian Church.' As if the community of Ephesian Christians, which had flourished so many years in full organization (Acts xx.) and eminent stability (Ephes. i. 13—15), was not yet to be regarded as a part of the Christian Church!"

Now it happens, notwithstanding what we must call the bitterness of invective in this note, that the common version of Ephes. iii. 19, is not a *palpable error*, and was manifestly adhered to by Mr. Belsham, whether rightly or not, from conviction after examination. It will be sufficient for us to quote Dr. Bloomfield's note:

"In the interpretation of these words, the commentators, as on many other occasions, exceedingly differ. But, as often, the most natural, simple, and extensive application will be found the best. Now, as the Apostle had been speaking of the immense and inconceivable love of God and Christ, so here (I assent to Grotius, Whitby, Crellius, and Macknight) he means to say that by thus attaining the Holy Spirit, and having suitable conceptions of the great mystery of Redeeming love, they may be filled with all the spiritual gifts and blessings, both ordinary and extraordinary, that God can and will impart to his faithful worshipers. Εἰς *is put for* εν; *than which nothing is more frequent in Scripture.* Compare infra iv. 10, and Col. i. 9."—Bl. Recensio Synoptica, Vol. VII. p. 581.

This distinguished scholar, and the eminent critics whom he here follows, will, in the estimation of most persons, at least protect Mr. Belsham from the charges of retaining a *palpable error*, and ignorantly or unfaithfully arguing from the *inaccuracy* of a translation. In the Improved Version, it seems, Dr. Smith's *true rendering* is barely mentioned in a note, (two different translations, however doubtful the case, can hardly be both introduced into the text—one must be placed in a note, or else neglected,) with a *vapid* and *silly* interpretation. We will only say this interpretation is that of Schleusner, (in verb. πληρωμα, No. 7,) to whom Mr. Belsham refers; and no competent judge—no one who examines his references and reflects on what he says—will treat it with contempt, even if he should be induced ultimately to reject it.

We must now quote a paragraph from the fourth chapter, "On the Errors and Faults, in relation to this Controversy, attributable to Unitarian Writers," which, for its uncandid and illiberal spirit, we have hardly seen surpassed, even in the course of our attention to the Unitarian controversy:

"It has appeard to me," says Dr. S, "that one of the distinguishing failings of the Unitarian theology is a propensity to generalize too soon, and to conclude too hastily, both in criticism and in argumentation. It seems the habit of its advocates to assume a few of the broadest facts in the scheme of Christianity, which are obvious to the most rapid glance: and, with a sweeping hand, they either crush down all the rest, and leave them unregarded, or they force them into an unnatural and disfiguring subordination to the favourite assumptions. Unlike the cautious and patient spirit of true philoso-

phy, which is always open to the collection and the careful estimation of facts, and which regards nothing as more hostile to its objects than a precipitate and foreclosing generalization, the Unitarian spirit rather resembles that of the old scholasticism, which spurned laborious investigation and slow induction, and would force all nature into its ranks of predicaments and predicables. This may be one reason, among others, why these notions meet with so ready an acceptance in young minds, inexperienced, flirty, and ambitious, half-learned, and ill-disciplined. Here is a theology easily acquired, discarding mysteries, treading down difficulties, and answering the pleas of the orthodox with summary contempt: a theology complimentary to the pride of those who deem themselves endowed with superior discernment, and which in practice is not ungenerously rigid against any favourite passion or little foible that is decently compatible with *the world's* code of morals."

We suppose we must expect Dr. S. to speak slightingly of our mode of reasoning, since he so little likes our conclusions, and we are very willing to leave our logic to its own defence; but we will venture, though the same thought will occur to most of our readers, to illustrate the character of mind—*young*, *inexperienced*, *flirty*, and *ambitious*, *half-learned*, and *ill-disciplined*—to which our doctrines have been found acceptable, by naming Milton, Newton, Locke, Lardner, Priestley—and Whitby and Watts, as the last resting-place of their minds, at the close of lives devoted to religious inquiries. We are tempted to enumerate others distinguished for their great attainments, their powers of mind, the prejudices with which they had to struggle, or the sacrifices they made to what they believed to be the truth, but it is needless. Dr. S. may have seen that Unitarianism recommends itself to *young* minds, ardent in the pursuit of truth, *ambitious* of being distinguished in promoting it, too *inexperienced* to be influenced by motives of worldly wisdom, not yet having their own thoughts lost and buried in a mass of ill-digested *learning*, too *ill-disciplined* to suppress as criminal the doubts which inquiry may suggest—and he forgets that the same views have satisfied the matured judgment of those whose fame he cannot injure, have been entertained with the fullest conviction by those whose genius, learning, and virtues, he cannot prevent the better part of mankind from admiring. We will not stop to compare Dr. S.'s own confidence in his superior discernment with our recollections of what we have seen manifested by Unitarian writers; but when our theology is described as "in practice not ungenerously rigid against any favourite passion or little foible that is decently compatible with the WORLD'S code of morals," we are called upon to reject the calumny; we are entitled to express the disgust with which it affects us. We ask first, what there is in the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity which should make their professors indulgent to sinful passions, and ready to conform their standard of duty to the merely prudential requisitions of the worldly-minded and irreligious? Like others, they are taught that they are constantly under the eye of an all-seeing God, perfect in holiness and purity, who has made known to them their duty, and who will *one day bring every work into judgment with every secret thought.* Is it then because they believe that this all-perfect Being has given them laws, not for his own glory, but for their happiness, and that the strict observance of these laws is essential to their attainment of any real or permanent good? Is it because they are assured that sin and suffering are inseparably connected, and that a death-bed repentance is vainly relied upon to avert the consequences of a life of wickedness? Is it because they are taught that they must "*work out* THEIR OWN *salvation with fear and trembling*," and have not learned to put their trust in another's merits? Is it because, whilst they rely on

their heavenly Father and Friend mercifully accepting their faithful endeavours to perform their duty, to correct their faults, and to improve their characters, they feel certain that no rational hope can be founded on any thing less than earnest and prevailing endeavours to do right, accompanied by honest self-examination, sincere repentance of known faults, and constant efforts after improvement? On account of which of these characteristic doctrines is it that they should be judged likely as a body, rather than other professing Christians, to make light of the evil of sin, to find excuses for the indulgence of bad passions, and to join themselves with those who, thinking only of present pleasure, make the decencies of society, not the rules of duty, the standard by which they regulate their conduct?

We ask, again, are Unitarian Christians in fact distinguished from those amongst whom they live by being less strict in the government of their own appetites, less honest and liberal in their dealings with others, less kind and charitable towards their suffering fellow-creatures? We know that they are not generally thought so by those who differ from them most widely in sentiment. They are often, through misapprehension of their opinions, accused of relying on their good works, but seldom of any remarkable deficiency in performing them. We have no disposition to praise them highly. We lament that they do not come nearer to what, with their advantages, might reasonably be expected. We would to God we could see them more deeply imbued with their professed principles, and more uniformly acting as becomes their high and holy calling; but we cannot silently allow them to be unjustly and uncandidly condemned. We well know that the faults with which they are chargeable are not effects of their religious principles, but consequences of these not being cherished and felt as they deserve to be: and as the language of Dr. Smith has forcibly reminded us of those whom we have known most truly under the influence of the peculiar religious sentiments in which we rejoice, most firmly convinced of their truth, and most constantly applying them in practice—of those whose pure minds, elevated affections, warm and habitual piety, strict integrity, and active benevolence, have been to our conceptions a genuine and glowing representation of the Christian life—of some who yet remain to edify and bless their friends—of others who have already found their faith triumphant over death, and have closed their pilgrimage as became those who had spent it in preparation for that better world, of which through the gospel of Jesus they entertained an assured expectation—that language has appeared to us so inexcusably unjust, so entirely founded in culpable ignorance and prejudice, and dictated by so arrogantly censorious a spirit, that whilst we appeal from his judgment, we cannot help reminding him of the responsibility under which he has passed sentence upon us.

In his fifth chapter, Dr. S. makes somewhat more particular charges against the conduct of Unitarians, which, that we may not have to return to the subject, we shall here notice. He accuses them of being generally, "so far as station and circumstances afford opportunities," devoted to "all the forms of gay amusement and fashionable dissipation;" of neglecting the ordinances of religion, and of not honouring the Lord's-day. With respect to the first of these charges, we cannot tell what Dr. Smith may have seen, but from pretty extensive opportunities for observation, we feel ourselves warranted in giving the opinion, that the members of Unitarian congregations (meaning, of course, those who are of a rank to be within reach of the temptation) *generally* partake very moderately in the gaieties of life, and are not justly chargeable with dissipation. It is true they do not think every

thing which has the name of pleasure criminal, and consider it as a point of duty to abstain from it; they do not affect that peculiar austerity which is so frequently characteristic either of the bigot or the hypocrite; but we should describe them as concerning themselves little with the follies of fashion, entering very moderately into scenes devoted to amusement, pursuing the quiet walks of business, of social duty, and of innocent social enjoyment.

There is, however, no sect which exhibits any thing approaching to uniformity of excellence among its members: each has many connected with it who are considered by the better part as doing no credit to the principles they profess, and being by no means truly under their influence. Now, it should be observed that Unitarianism, as understood by the majority of its professors, not attaching to the externals of religion the same essential and inherent importance with most other systems, and affording no inducements to hypocrisy, a thoughtless devotion to the gaieties of the world is just the fault into which our less worthy and serious members are apt to fall; not to mention that there are many partially connected with us, who, though disbelieving the doctrines of reputed Orthodoxy, and finding their remaining belief Unitarian, have never been brought to interest themselves on the subject, and are never acknowledged by us as those from whom a practical exhibition of the effects of our principles could be expected. On the contrary, among the orthodox sects, including those members of the Establishment who make any considerable pretensions to religion, a particular attention to all outward observances is essential to character: they consider abstinence from the gaieties of life as a direct requisition of duty, and the faults to which their situation most exposes them are hypocrisy and the vices which it may conveniently cloak. That they are not all free from these faults, is sufficiently notorious.

The Unitarian Christian does not in general feel himself under any obligation to such an observance of the Lord's-day as Dr. S. deems essential to a religious character, although not many, perhaps, may go so far the other way as Calvin or Mr. Belsham: but it certainly is not just to accuse men of irreligion because they wish to be influenced by their religion every day equally, when no precept applying the strict sabbatical law to Christians can possibly be produced, and its practical utility may, to say the least, be reasonably called in question.

It is not to be doubted, that among Unitarians the outward observances of religion are commonly regarded less as the performance of a direct duty, and more as means of improvement voluntarily resorted to, than amongst other sects. Those who think most of the absolute duty of paying a public homage to Almighty God, in the name of his chosen Messenger, will not, amongst us, pretend to determine how many times in one day this may be required; and as on the question of expediency different opinions may be formed, those who think most seriously do not make the same point of attending worship several times on each Lord's-day with persons of a less degree of real religious feeling in other sects; whilst indolence or carelessness more readily amongst us find excuses for the neglect of some valuable opportunities for improvement. We regret this result, because we are sure that all the services which are ever attempted by us, might be made useful and found interesting; to some classes of society they are particularly important; and that improvement of plan which would make them all that they might be, can hardly be expected, except under the sanction of a zealous and uniform attendance. We regret, then, much that our people, though

very many of them are exemplary, are not, speaking of them as a body, such regular frequenters of *all* the services of the house of God, (there are very few, we believe, who habitually or wantonly absent themselves from one service,) as the members of other sects; but we will not consent that what we both lament and blame should be considered as proving the absence of interest in religion, knowing, as we do, that many who will ordinarily attend but one service, will devoutly join in that one, and seriously endeavour to profit by it; knowing also that many will attend three or four services in a day, thinking that in so doing they are performing what is required or highly acceptable, and yet not seem much wiser or better for the whole. In short, we allow that Unitarians attach less importance to the ordinances and public exercises of religion, as *compared* with its feelings and its other duties, than their fellow-christians in general; that, in consequence, some may estimate their value at too low a rate, and indolence will more frequently tempt the less serious among them to a partial neglect of what ought, for our own good, and the good of our brethren, to be strictly observed by us all: but we deny that our body is chargeable with a general or habitual neglect of this kind of duties. There is a considerable proportion of it whose zeal for the public exercises of religion goes quite as far as is reasonable or useful; and we deny that the partial neglect (though an evil) by any means constantly implies indifference or impiety.

Dr. S. has shewn his want of any solid grounds for the accusations he has made, as well as the kind of spirit by which he was animated, in the most unfair use which he has made of a passage from an anonymous letter in the former series of this work. (Mon. Repos. December, 1817, p. 717.) The writer of that letter is evidently lamenting that persons belonging by *education* and *habit to the Establishment*, although brought to perceive the truth of our doctrines, as they are ready in conversation to avow, often cannot be induced so far to break through old habits and connexions as to join our worship, either continuing to frequent the church, or going nowhere. This Dr. S. represents as a testimony coming from ourselves to the neglect of religious ordinances amongst us. We give him credit for having mistaken, not wilfully falsified, the author's meaning; but with what views did he read, when he justified so serious a charge by evidence of such a character?

The following passage, being part of the additional matter with which our author has enriched his second edition, may, perhaps, be best noticed in this connexion; we feel it to be the more necessary to offer some remarks upon it, because the subject is one which has excited some uneasiness amongst ourselves, and Dr. S.'s information has probably been derived from papers inserted in a former volume of this work (Mon. Repos. Vol. XXI.):

"But I go farther, and make my appeal to intelligent and candid Unitarians themselves, whether they are not perfectly aware that a proportion, not inconsiderable or uninfluential, of their congregations, at the present time, throughout our country, consists of persons who do not disguise their scepticism or even settled disbelief with regard to the divine origin and paramount authority of the Christian religion? What has produced this coalition? Why does it continue, with every appearance of mutual contentment? Is not the undeniable cause a congeniality of spirit, and a conviction, on the part of those sceptics and infidels, that the theory of Unitarianism approaches so nearly to their own, that any remaining differences may be well accommodated to the satisfaction of each party?"

Exaggerated as we believe the statement here made to be, we acknowledge that it has a foundation in truth. We are aware that in some few

places Unitarian congregations contain a small number of persons either sceptical, or denying the divine origin and authority of Christianity; but before we feel any shame at this fact, or admit the justice of any unfavourable inferences from it, we must inquire, first, why such persons desire to join our societies; secondly, what is implied on our part in receiving them as fellow-worshipers; and, thirdly, what are the actual, or what will be the probable, effects of the union so far as it exists. Now, as to the first point, it is plain that no one will attend on Unitarian services from mere worldly motives, because the most open opposition to all religion is not more unpopular—is, indeed, by many even less severely condemned, than the testimony against its corruptions which is borne by Unitarians. Those who in rejecting revelation despise all religion, either frequent no place of worship, or go to the Established Church, from motives of interest or fashion. Those, on the contrary, who believe in the existence, perfections, and government of God, in the necessity of virtue to human happiness, and in a future retributory state—who consequently desire to pay public homage to God, and to listen to moral instructions and exhortations—if from any cause they find it not convenient to have services on their own principles, will, of course, wish to attend where they hear most of what they approve, and least of what they disapprove, and will thus be naturally led to Unitarian places of worship. They can have no motive for appearing there but what is creditable to themselves—the desire of shewing respect for practical religion, and in the purest form which circumstances admit of paying their social homage to the God of Nature and of Providence. If, as many do, though in our judgment inconsistently with the rejection of his divine authority, they regard the morality taught by Christ as most excellent, and his character as deserving of respect, they will hear in a Unitarian service nothing to disgust them, though a good deal which they cannot admit as true, and their coming can be taken only as a testimony of their desire to cultivate pious affections, and to promote their moral improvement. As no confession of faith is required, they are guilty of no insincerity, and cannot be accused of making any false professions—to which, indeed, no possible inducement is held out. What, then, let us next inquire, is implied on the part of Unitarian Christians in receiving as fellow-worshipers those who do not believe in the divine mission of him who is acknowledged as their Lord and Saviour? And here it is important to observe, that the English Presbyterian congregations, which form the great majority of those now entertaining Unitarian sentiments, in consequence at first of the impossibility of practically carrying into effect, in their circumstances, the mode of church government which they approved, and afterwards of a growing attachment to religious liberty, and jealousy of all interferences with it, have long been *entirely without any attempt at a church constitution or discipline.* A minister of the general religious sentiments of the majority of the people, and who is believed to possess suitable qualifications, is chosen, who, studying the Scriptures freely for himself, is to teach what he believes to be Gospel truth. All who desire to hear his instructions, constitute the congregation. There is no creed; no man is called in question by his brethren respecting his faith; the minister does not feel himself justified in going beyond friendly advice and such discussion as may seem to him likely to be useful. The ordinances of religion are closed against no one who satisfies his own conscience as to the propriety of his partaking in them, and no one is subjected to unpleasant proceedings if he think it right to absent himself from any of them; and thus, in fact, until new regulations are made for the purpose, it is not in the power of a con-

gregation of Unitarian Christians to prevent their being joined by any other persons who may desire to be numbered amongst them.

If congregations of Unitarian Christians were voluntary associations of persons deliberately making profession of certain common principles, and therefore, of course, excluding those who think differently, we know not that any one could question their right thus to constitute themselves, or, so long as there is no desire to inflict any injury on others thinking differently, could have any reasonable cause for complaint. In that case, though any one might come as a hearer, none could be a member of the society who could not make a solemn declaration of belief in the same sentiments. But what, let us now ask, should we gain as to the usefulness of our services by such a measure? We should discourage the conscientious Deist, or the yet hesitating Sceptic, from attending the only public services in which they can join with advantage, and which, we trust, have a tendency to correct what we regard as their very serious errors, as well as to encourage their juster sentiments and excite their better feelings; and we should do this from the selfish hope of standing some trifle higher in the estimation of those who, in the face of our most solemn declarations of our belief in the divine authority of our Saviour, and in the inestimable benefit of his mission, can still accuse us of congeniality of sentiment respecting the character and claims of the gospel with sceptics and infidels. Are we, then, ashamed because even those who cannot bring themselves to admit the revelation to which we gratefully ascribe all our light and all our hopes, yet acknowledge that our doctrines appear to them to be those of true and practical religion, and that they themselves are happier and better for listening to them? Are we grieved because *almost they are persuaded to be Christians*—because they allow the truth and goodness of our instructions, and the force of the additional arguments by which we recommend them, even whilst they call in question their having been communicated by divine authority? We must, indeed, think that those who reject Christianity, even if they make the most of Natural Religion, and much more than we can believe would ever have been made of it without the indirect aid of Revelation, are yet in an error, seriously pernicious to themselves, and fraught with dangerous consequences to others; and if, in consequence of the knowledge that some such persons came amongst us, we suppressed the expression of our own convictions, dwelling less earnestly on the claims of our Lord to our love and obedience, or on the blessed hopes which we found on his promises and resurrection, we might then justly be condemned; but so long as we are only rendered more anxious to establish the authority of our revered Master, more abundant in our labours to cause his name to be honoured, his commands respected, and his promises cherished, it would be difficult to say how our faith should be implicated in the homage which is paid to the purity and excellence of the system we teach, even by those who professedly do not join with us in attributing to it a divine original. It will be recollected that to such persons we make no concessions; we advance not one step to meet them. We rejoice that the Christianity which we derive from the Scriptures is not repulsive to the natural reason of man, in an age of accumulated knowledge and high intellectual culture; but we alter not one jot or one tittle of what we find in the Scriptures to satisfy either our own reason or that of others, because divine instruction is intended to supply the deficiencies of reason, and, if received at all, must be received as authoritative. We rejoice that any, who agree with us in any great principle, will come and worship along with us; and God forbid that we should

threaten them in consequence of the deficiencies of their faith, or pretend to identify the opinions, however erroneous in our judgment, which they have formed in a sincere desire to know the truth, with the corrupt and wicked opposition made to the Gospel by the unbelievers whom our Lord condemns.

We cannot wonder that those who, on grounds of Natural Religion exclusively, believe in essentially the same truths respecting the perfections, character, and government of God, the duties and expectations of man, which we rejoice in as revealed to us through Jesus Christ, should be better satisfied with our services than with those which are founded on doctrines believed by them to be absurd and pernicious; and we have no wish to close our doors against them. They are not of us; but they are willing to be with us—we hope they will not be the worse for joining with us. It remains to be inquired whether they do us any real injury. What are the effects of the union so far as it exists? We have shewn that it is not the result of any formal agreement between the parties, but simply the consequence of the constitution of our congregations. A place is set apart for Christian worship on Unitarian principles; there is no creed or test of any kind employed; no one claims a right to inquire into his neighbour's faith; the minister feels himself called upon to do all which circumstances will allow, publicly and privately to improve all his hearers in Christian knowledge and practice, but pretends to no authority to mark any with the sign of his approbation or censure; all may enter freely; and whoever thinks it right to contribute to the support of public worship becomes, by that act, a member of the congregation. Since, then, it is acknowledged that serious Deists must necessarily regard Unitarian Christians as teaching chiefly what is true and useful, and as much nearer to them in opinions than other Christians, it is plain why some such persons have joined Unitarian congregations; and it is evident that, though they are received in all kindness and friendship, there exists no formal or solid union between them and their fellow-worshipers; and that from their presence no conclusion can justly be drawn respecting the sentiments of any who profess themselves Unitarian *Christians.* By their presence we are certainly injured, inasmuch as it gives occasion for uncandid adversaries to misrepresent our opinions; but we trust that no consideration of this kind will ever induce us to change our conduct towards any of our fellow-creatures. Can they, then, cause the sentiments delivered in our pulpits to be less truly Christian sentiments? This is only possible either by their unfavourably influencing the choice of our ministers, or by their causing them, through fear of offence, not as much as they ought to support their instructions by Christian authority, or to dwell on those affections and hopes which peculiarly belong to the Gospel. With respect to the first of these means—it is a thing perfectly understood amongst all who frequent our worship, whatever may be their own particular views, that it is Christian worship to which they are giving their countenance: a very great majority in every congregation would be both dissatisfied and much shocked at the thought of any other. No open attempt could be made to substitute services founded on mere natural religion, without an immediate separation of those who approved from those who disapproved of the measure; that is, without the friends of the measure meeting avowedly as Deists, which they are at liberty to do, so far as we are concerned, whenever they judge it expedient. An attempt *artfully* to introduce, as a Christian minister, a person not really deserving of that name, would be inconsistent with that character and those views which alone can lead men to worship God at all, and is, therefore, not likely to be made; whilst it could hardly

fail to be detected, and consequently, if made, could only end in the disgrace of its authors. All who attend on the services of religion are equally interested in the minister who is to conduct them possessing such character, attainments, and address, as will give most weight to his instructions, most dignity and usefulness to his office. In the pursuit of these objects all may join, and theory combines with experience to prove that, in the case now under our consideration, no injurious consequences are to be apprehended. As to the other supposed means of injury—if ministers are capable of modifying their *doctrines* according to the supposed taste of any of their hearers, they may just as easily modify their *moral instructions* on the same principle, and the utility of their office is at an end. We think it is not without reason that better things are expected from them. We have great confidence in the effects of their peculiar studies and habits of thought, in ennobling, purifying, and strengthening the mind; we have great confidence in their knowledge, that, in a vast majority of cases, the honest and faithful performance of their duty is the way to secure the esteem and affection of the great body of their hearers, and there is abundant proof from experience that the confidence we express is justly placed. We conclude the whole subject with the observation, that it is notorious that Unitarianism has brought numbers to a joyful and grateful acknowledgement of revelation, who had been driven to reject it by the revolting character of more prevalent forms of Christianity, whilst very few pass from Unitarianism to Unbelief, and with those few it appears to be the result of peculiarities of individual character or circumstances, not of any natural current setting from the one doctrine towards the other. We are by no means sure that on this important subject we have expressed the general sentiments of the Unitarian body; though, believing that we have expressed the dictates of justice and charity, we would hope that our brethren do not widely differ from us. Many, no doubt, regard Unbelievers with a sort of horror—probably from an opinion that none become so but from wilful obstinacy and moral corruption. That these are the causes of a great deal of unbelief is unquestionable; but a sceptical turn of mind, unfavourable impressions made at the most critical period of life, and disgust at doctrines represented as essential, cause a good deal more; and those Unbelievers who shew any disposition to come amongst us, are generally persons possessing a real respect for religion, and desire to improve by its exercises. We do not, therefore, wish to see them condemned or rejected, and we have great doubt as to the advantage of the only measure which could secure a separation between us and them—the adoption of a profession of faith and a system of church-membership. We do not question the right to adopt this measure, and we do not venture to decide on its expediency, but we think we have abundantly shewn that there is nothing which either party need be ashamed of in the circumstance of our societies, open as they now are, having been in some places joined by individuals not professing to believe in revelation, nothing which throws the smallest imputation on the sincerity of our own faith, or gives the least cause for exultation to our adversaries.

Passing by much matter of a merely personal character, which, though in our opinion both unjust and illiberal, can hardly be thought to require the answer which it would occupy much space to give, we shall now offer a few remarks on Dr. Smith's "Observations on the Introduction to the Calm Inquiry."

Mr. Belsham very judiciously reminds his readers, that since "all Christians agree that Jesus of Nazareth was to outward appearance a man like

other men," and that his prophetic office, miracles, and resurrection, do not necessarily imply his superiority of nature, "it follows, that in this inquiry the whole burden of proof lies upon those who assert the pre-existence, the original dignity, and the divinity of Jesus Christ." The Unitarian finds nothing more in the Scriptures than what all acknowledge to be there—others imagine that much more is to be found—it is their business to bring forward their proofs: we establish our own doctrine, if we only shew those alleged proofs to be insufficient.

"In this controversy, therefore," continues Mr. B., "the proper province of the Arian and Trinitarian is to propose the evidence of their respective hypotheses; that is, to state those passages of Scripture which they conceive to be conclusive in favour of their doctrines. *The sole concern of the Unitarian is, to shew that these arguments are inconclusive.*"—(Calm Inquiry, p. 2.)

It would hardly seem possible to extract from these words any other meaning than that the Unitarian, himself fully convinced that his own is the doctrine of Scripture, will have done every thing required for convincing his opponents when he has shewn the inconclusiveness of the texts brought forward by them, since by general confession what remains, after the peculiar evidence for reputed orthodoxy is taken away, is Unitarianism. Yet upon this observation, perfectly just as a logical position, and, one might have thought, altogether inoffensive in its mode of expression, Dr. Smith has the following remarks:

"This might be proper, if controvertists had no love to truth, nor sense of its value; if they were theological prize-fighters, who cared for nothing but victory or the semblance of victory. But ill do such expressions comport with the mind and motives of a sincere and serious and 'calm inquirer' after an object so momentous as SACRED AND ETERNAL TRUTH. To obtain that object *ought* to be the *sole concern* of Unitarians, and of all other men; and it solemnly behoves those who are pleased with this consequential flippancy of assertion, to examine well the state of their own hearts before him who will not be mocked."

It is a strange misapprehension of Mr. B.'s meaning, which has given occasion to this vituperative language. We need not point out the dispositions to which the error may be traced.

Another very important caution of Mr. B., which has also excited Dr. Smith's wrath, is the following:

"Impartial and sincere inquirers after truth must be particularly upon their guard against what is called the natural signification of words and phrases. The connexion between words and ideas is perfectly arbitrary: so that the natural sense of any word to any person means nothing more than the sense in which he has been accustomed to understand it. But it is very possible that men who lived two thousand years ago might annex very different ideas to the same words and phrases; so that the sense which appears most foreign to us might be most natural to them."

"If," says Dr. S., "the Calm Inquirer means only to assert that the interpretation of a language must proceed on an enlightened acquaintance with its idioms, he has said no more than a school-boy knows and practises every day. But it is doing no service to the improvement of reason or the investigation of truth to represent the phrases 'natural signification,' and 'natural sense,' as if they were properly or usually applied to the bald and blundering methods of translation, which betray those who use them to be ignorant of the principles of language. I am greatly mistaken if the established use of those expressions, with correct speakers, is not to denote that sense of a word

or phrase which it would carry, at the time, and under all the circumstances, in the minds of the persons to whom it was originally addressed."

The author goes on to shew that the connexion between words and ideas depends on the laws of association, and that we are possessed of means by which a moral certainty may be attained as to the true meaning of words and phrases in ancient writings, all which is in perfect agreement with Mr. B.'s principles: indeed, it is acknowledged in a note "that the Calm Inquirer has, in another of his observations, recognized the principal rules of interpretation."

Mr. B. warns the impartial inquirer against "what is called the natural signification of words and phrases."

We read the Bible daily from childhood upwards, and it may be hoped that we do not read it without attaching some meaning to the words. The sense in which we first take its various parts must either be that which is suggested by parents and instructors, or that which occurs to ourselves at a time when neither our knowledge nor judgment is much to be relied upon. This sense is by frequent perusal strongly associated with the words and phrases, and immediately occurs to us as belonging to them whenever we consider them; it is *what is called* their *natural sense*, and is in general, to a great degree, the sense ascribed to them by those amongst whom we live: but if we are serious inquirers after divine truth, we shall examine and correct it by a faithful application of the just principles of interpretation, which will often shew us that the sense which seemed natural to us, has little pretensions to be accounted the true one. Now, there is nothing more common than to object to the best-founded and most valuable explanations of Scripture, that they are unnatural, that they give to the words a forced and unnatural sense, when nothing is really intended but that they are not familiar to us, and are opposed to our established associations. Dr. S. must, on reflection, be well aware that feelings of this kind are among the most formidable obstacles to the right understanding of Scripture, and he will hardly say that they do not furnish the most common answers to Unitarian expositions of Scripture: he certainly will not maintain that an answer founded on them is sufficient: let him then be ashamed of his angry declamation, and acknowledge that the Calm Inquirer's remark is neither "a mere truism," nor "a denial of all certainty in philological studies," but a useful practical caution of which most readers who are not critical scholars, and not a few who are, stand greatly in need.

Dr. S. is greatly scandalized at the expression, "the incarceration of the Creator of the world in the body of a helpless, puling infant," employed by Mr. B. in describing the orthodox doctrine. We do not wish to defend any thing which needlessly hurts the feelings of others, but as Dr. S. talks of *misrepresentation*, we must remind him that the language is justified by that seriously used by very orthodox writers. What is to be thought of the following language from Bacon?

"The Christian believes a Virgin to be the mother of a Son; *and that very Son of hers her Maker.* He believes him to have been *shut up in a narrow cell,* whom *heaven and earth could not contain.* He believes him to have been born in time, who was and is from eternity. He believes him to have *been a weak child and carried in arms,* who *is Almighty;* and him *once to have died,* who *alone has life and immortality.*"

When such is the language of orthodox piety, the Unitarian may surely be excused some little strength of expression on the subject.

Dr. S. concludes his observations on Mr. B.'s introduction, and with them the first great division of his work, in these words:

"It would have been no disparagement to the writer of the *Calm Inquiry*, had he urged the duty of cherishing impartiality, sincerity, and the love of truth, *by the means* of assiduous PRAYER to the Author of truth, a recollection of our amenableness to his tribunal, and a holy state of our mental feelings, in reference to his presence and perfections. Without these moral cautions, can it be expected that our inquiries will be really impartial or will terminate successfully? The principles of human nature and the righteousness of the Divine government equally forbid the expectation. Happy will those be who realize the devotion and faith of him who said, 'With THEE is the fountain of life; in THY light we shall see light!' But on such subjects the *Calm Inquiry* observes the silence of death."

Mr. B. recommends impartiality, and the sincere, disinterested love of truth; he does not enter on the means of attaining and cultivating these qualities, because those means are not unknown or much disputed: he was writing a controversial, not a practical work, and he meant to confine himself to one volume of moderate size, where he could not, like Dr. S., give 200 pages to introductory considerations. Nothing can be found in his book unfavourable to habits of devotion or feelings of piety. The impartiality which he recommends—the love of truth, without regard to external advantages, sensual pleasures, or the gratification of ambition and vanity—is itself a *holy state of the mental feelings*, and it is hard to reproach him with *the silence of death* when he speaks learnedly and ably on the subject he undertakes to discuss, because he does not digress into a practical treatise on devotion and faith. Sincere devotion, and prayer, its noblest exercise and best excitement, are most valuable means of producing the dispositions which aid us in the search for truth; but it must be remembered, that there is a sort of prayer often employed in what is called religious inquiry, which is no more than a mustering of fears and prejudices against the admission of any new light, or an attempt to overpower the resistance of reason to popular opinions by an accumulation of distempered and enthusiastic feelings. There are many also who pray indeed for help from God in the understanding of his word; but, entertaining the unfounded expectation of that help being afforded in the form of immediate and supernatural assistance, instead of improving by their pious exercises in the humble and diligent application of the means of knowledge, are puffed up with a vain conceit of their infallibility, and led to ascribe to their own crudest conceptions the authority of divine communication. As these are faults into which those who agree with Dr. S. are peculiarly apt to fall, we have at least as good reason for wondering that he did not guard against such common and dangerous abuses of what he justly recommends, as he had for reproaching Mr. B. with his silence on a subject which his plan did not oblige him to introduce.

We have been able to notice but a few of the more important passages in that portion of Dr. Smith's work which has now engaged our attention. There is hardly a page in which something does not call for animadversion, and there are some subjects of very high interest, as the Unitarian views of the perfections of God, and the inspiration of the Scriptures, which demand distinct essays to do them any justice. We hope, however, that what we have done may be sufficient to make known the true character of what is represented as a formidable attack on our opinions, to expose the treatment which Mr. Belsham has received from one who would willingly be thought a candid adversary, and to repel some charges which, though glaringly

false, may be said to be admitted, because Unitarians have not thought it needful to give them a distinct denial—because, in short, no one has yet undertaken the labour of a reply, which must occupy at least three volumes, and when finished, might probably be neglected—by our friends, because they are already fully satisfied—by our opponents, because very few of them desire to know any thing of our side of the question.

The Introduction to Dr. Smith's second book is chiefly occupied with an attack on Mr. Belsham for not having gone over all the same ground with the author, and for having dismissed the few passages he has noticed from the Old Testament, with an expression respecting their application in this controversy, nearly approaching to contempt.

It must be recollected that the object of Mr. B.'s work is not to collect every thing in Scripture relating to the Messiah, but to examine the principal arguments which have been adduced in support of the notions of his superhuman or divine nature. When we consider, therefore, not only how precarious are the grounds for applying to the Messiah at all many of the passages brought forward by Dr. S., but how small a proportion of them, granting the interpretation put upon them, supply any substantial argument respecting his nature, and that of those which are made to appear most important, many have not been insisted upon by the best writers in defence of reputed orthodoxy, previous to our learned and ingenious author, we cannot be much surprised that Mr. B. did not feel himself called upon to devote any distinct portion of his work to the Old Testament. As to his manner of expression, every writer feels himself authorized to express his opinion on the comparative force of the arguments which pass under his consideration: it is agreed, on all hands, that learned and able men have often been "imposed upon by miserable sophisms," and the statement of our belief that this has happened in a particular case, the whole matter being submitted to the judgment of the reader, cannot be considered as going beyond what is allowable in controversy. When, indeed, we attribute what we regard as the errors of our opponents to pride or other evil passions, or represent them as wilfully perverting the truth, and misrepresenting the Sacred Records, we are chargeable with passing the bounds of fair discussion, and contending for victory with unlawful weapons. Of any such charge as this, we think the "Calm Inquirer" must be acquitted even by his enemies. Dr. Smith, as appears from what we have already brought forward, by no means comes before the tribunal of the public with so good a case. We most sincerely give him credit for much amiable and truly Christian feeling, but a man who talks so much of candour as he does, can hardly be excused in so often forgetting its dictates.

The enumeration of passages is prefaced by the following statement:

"In this enumeration it is proposed to bring forwards, not every text which has been adduced by biblical interpreters as referring to the Messiah, but only those which, according to the criteria above (in the preceding chapter) laid down, carry certain, or, at least, probable evidence of having been so designed. The degrees of that evidence will of course be various: but if the passages which appear to be of the least convincing kind, be struck out of the following list, still it is apprehended that enough will remain to furnish a satisfactory conclusion. The number might be greatly reduced without at all diminishing the weight of the argument."

In reviewing this enumeration, our narrow limits will oblige us to pass by without notice all such passages, however interesting in themselves, as have no direct bearing on the questions concerning the person of the Messiah,

and the nature or mode of the deliverance he effected for mankind. Interpretations, however doubtful, or even in our estimation decidedly false, which might be received by a Unitarian consistently with his general views of Christian truth, we do not undertake now to examine, but we shall endeavour to neglect no passage among thirty-two (exclusive of the sections on the "angel of Jehovah," and on the plural names) which Dr. Smith produces, in which we could not, as Unitarians, receive his interpretation, without our characteristic opinions being in any degree affected. We may safely presume that Dr. Smith has not omitted any thing of much importance. We shall endeavour to assist the intelligent and candid reader in estimating the value of what he has produced.

Sect. ii. Gen. iv. 1: "I have obtained a man JEHOVAH." "From the special record of this exclamation of Eve on the birth of her first son, and from the very marked importance which is given to it," [it is preserved merely as an explanation of the name Cain, *acquisition*, and the signs of any very peculiar importance being attached to it are not obvious,] "it may reasonably be considered as the expression of her eager and pious, though mistaken, expectation that the promise, (ch. iii. 15,) which could not but have created the strongest feelings of interest and hope," [it is a matter, nevertheless, of very great doubt whether the words referred to imply any promise at all,] "was now beginning to be accomplished. The primary, proper, and usual force of the particle (את) placed here before JEHOVAH, is to designate an object in the most demonstrative and emphatical manner." "It is true, that in subsequent periods of the language, this particle came to be used as a preposition, to denote *with* or *by the instrumentality of*; but this was but a secondary idiom, and many of its supposed instances, on a closer consideration, fall into the ordinary construction. There seems, therefore, no option to an interpreter who is resolved to follow faithfully the fair and strict grammatical signification of the words before him, but to translate the passage as it is given above.'—Scrip. Test. Vol. I. p. 235.

What can Dr. S. mean by saying that the *primary* and *proper* sense of the particle [את] is to designate an object "in the most demonstrative and emphatical manner"? For this purpose it is most usually employed: but it has, without doubt, *originally* been a noun independently significant, and all its uses as a particle, whether as the sign of a case, or mere emphatic accompaniment of a noun, or as a preposition, are but certain applications of the *original* and *proper* sense, of which, though one may have become much more common, we have no right on that account merely to say that it is either older or better established. It appears to be sufficiently proved, that את, in at least two passages besides the one under consideration, bears the sense of *from*, and in several others *by means of*, either of which would remove all difficulty from this passage—in one of these ways too it has been understood by most of the ancient translators. Yet, because the particle is of much more frequent occurrence as an emphatic ascompaniment of nouns, (an argument which, if consistently followed up, would never allow us to give to any word more than one sense,) we are called upon to admit a translation which, understood literally, is in the highest degree revolting and absurd, and from which no rational and probable meaning can be extracted. That the applications of the particle as a preposition are secondary and of a later age, is a mere arbitrary assumption; and, after all, how is it to be proved to us that the documents employed by Moses had not their expression in any degree altered by him, or even, as their antiquity must have been so extraordinary, that they had not previously to his time existed only in hieroglyphics? It is enough for us, however, that there is not the slightest

foundation for Dr. S.'s assertion as to the *necessity* of the extraordinary translation he has adopted. Eve said, "I have *acquired* a man *from* (or *through*) Jehovah;" she therefore called his name CAIN (acquisition). It was quite natural for her thus to express her joy at receiving what she could not but regard as a great comfort and blessing, and there is no reason for seeking any mystery in the words, or for supposing that whatever hopes they may be thought to imply related to the approaching fulfilment of any divine promises.

We pass to Sect. viii. 2 Sam. xxiii. 1—7. The passage contains what is believed to be the latest written of the poems of David. It apparently relates to his confidence in the fulfilment of God's promises respecting the future glory of his family, but is thought by many to be prophetic of the reign of the Messiah, in which view it is brought forward by our author. Its interpretation is attended with great difficulty, owing probably to the corrupt state of the text, and we cannot but think the sense at present too uncertain for it to be appealed to as of any importance in the support of a controverted doctrine. As, however, Dr. Smith finds in it the direct application of the name Jehovah to the Messiah, we shall just lay before our readers the true state of the fact. 2 Sam. xxiii. 4, the Authorized Version gives, "And *he shall be* as the light of the morning, *when* the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; *as* the tender grass *springing* out of the earth by clear shining after rain." Dr. Smith, inserting the word JEHOVAH on the authority of a single Hebrew MS., (a valuable one certainly, yet only one,) doubtfully supported by the ancient Greek Version, translates thus:

Ver. 3. "Ruling over man is a Righteous one
Ruling in the fear of God:
Ver. 4. Even as the light of the morning shall he arise,
Jehovah the sun,
A morning without clouds for brightness,
(As) after rain the herbage from the earth."

Dr. Kennicott, who first brought to light the various reading, thus renders the words:

Ver. 3. "The Just one ruleth among men,
He ruleth by the fear of God!
Ver. 4. As the light of the morning ariseth JEHOVAH
A sun, without clouds, for brightness;
And as the grass from the earth after rain.
Ver. 5. Verily thus is my house with God," &c.

Though no considerate man would build much on a passage so doubtful, we allow that the authority for inserting the word Jehovah is important, and we think that Dr. K.'s version (which we much prefer to our author's) gives a much clearer sense than we have seen derived from the common text; but admitting this version, and admitting what is more doubtful, though we would not pretend positively to deny it, that the words are prophetic of the kingdom of the Messiah, the obvious and natural interpretation would be, not to regard JEHOVAH as a *name* given to the Messiah, but to consider the great events contemplated as the bright and glorious manifestation of his presence, the proofs of his fidelity to his covenant with David. It is found, then, that the passage is altogether very obscure; that its application to the subject of the Messiah is not a little doubtful; that its whole point in the controversy respecting the person of Christ, depends on an uncertain emendation of the text; and that, admitting this, (which, as it is plausible, and seems

to clear the sense, we are willing to do, though without placing much reliance upon it,) still the words are naturally explained of God's display of his power and glory in the gospel ; and the construction which makes "the just one" identical with JEHOVAH, is both needless and harsh—it is, indeed, absolutely inconsistent with the preceding and following clauses: "He ruleth *by the fear of God*"—"Thus is my house with God."

Sect. ix. Job xix. 23—27.

Dr. S.'s translation of this passage is very peculiar :

> Ver. 25. "I surely do know my REDEEMER, the LIVING ONE :
> And HE the LAST, will arise over the dust.
> Ver. 26. And after the disease has cut down my skin,
> Even from my flesh I shall see GOD."

It is represented as "a prophecy of the second coming of the only Redeemer and Judge of mankind," and as "unequivocally designating Him by the highest titles and attributes of Deity."

It may be sufficient for us to remark, that this passage is one of the most difficult in the Bible ; that of the immense number of critics who have applied themselves particularly to the book of Job, scarcely any two agree respecting its sense, or at least respecting the mode of deriving the sense from the words ; and that a large proportion, equal to any in learning and judgment, and many of them even in what is called orthodoxy of sentiment, have denied all reference of the words to a future state of existence ; whilst amongst those who have contended for their application to this subject, our author stands almost alone in maintaining their direct application to the Messiah, interpreted so as to apply to him the titles and attributes of Deity. Unless, then, his version be so peculiarly clear and satisfactory, and established by such irresistible force of evidence, as to justify its decided preference to those of all his predecessors, no person of common sense will give the passage much weight in a controversy respecting the personal nature of one who appeared in the world so many ages after it was written.

Now, Dr. S. himself will hardly venture to deny that the words of the original may, with strict propriety, be rendered,

> "For I know that my *deliverer* (or avenger) *liveth*,
> And that *hereafter* he will rise up over the dust," &c. :

where the epithets to which he attaches so much importance entirely disappear, and even if his version were admitted, the application to the Messiah would not, considering the connexion, be even probable. We should still agree with nearly all translators and commentators in supposing God himself to be referred to. We ourselves embrace with great confidence the opinion of those who maintain that Job here speaks only of a temporal deliverance, and that both the general object of the book and several remarkable passages in it, prove the author to have been ignorant of the doctrine of a future state : but whatever the reader may think on this point, we have made it evident that the application Dr. S. has made of the passage is utterly unfounded and indefensible.

Sect. x. Psalm ii.

"The last clause of the Psalm" (says Dr. Smith) "merits particular attention as demanding that TRUST and CONFIDENCE in the Messiah, which the general tenor of Scripture and many particular passages direct to be reposed only in the Almighty and Everlasting God. It is *religious* reliance that is required. If this powerful and victorious King were but a creature, such

confidence would be 'trusting in an arm of flesh,' and would mark 'a heart departing from the Lord.' But the *reason* upon which this confidence is called for is equally inapplicable to the idea of a mere creature. It is his *right* to the most absolute homage; it is his ability to bless; it is his *power* as shewn in the dreadful consequence of provoking his justice and incurring 'even but a little' of his righteous displeasure."—Scrip. Test., second edition, Vol. I. p. 307.

The last two verses of the Psalm are thus rendered by Dr. Smith:

11. "Serve Jehovah with reverence,
And rejoice with trembling.
12. Do homage to the Son, lest he be angry
And ye perish on the road;
When his wrath is even for a moment kindled!
Blessed are all who trust in HIM!"

Did it never occur to our author, that since "the general tenor of Scripture, and many particular passages direct (religious) trust and confidence to be reposed only in the Almighty and Everlasting God," it would be but reasonable to understand this passage in consistency with them, which may be done by a very obvious and altogether unobjectionable construction?

"Do homage to the Son, lest He *(Jehovah,* referring to the preceding verse) be angry,
And ye perish on the road (rather 'in your way');
When His (Jehovah's) wrath is even for a moment kindled.
Blessed are all who trust in *Him* (Jehovah)."

But, though all difficulty is even thus removed, we must not omit to observe that the original word, rendered by Dr. S. and most other translators, *Son,* and which truly has that meaning in the Chaldee dialect, cannot be proved to have it in pure Hebrew, but does signify *pure, sincere,* whence the words have been, with much probability of truth, translated, "Reverence sincerely," or, "offer sincere homage," "lest He be angry," &c., which makes the whole passage relate to God alone.

Another remark of Dr. S., that "the Messiah is clearly and plainly represented as an *existing* and *acting* person, at the time when the Psalm was written," is answered by observing, that there can be little doubt of the Psalm having had an immediate application to David himself, whatever secondary and prophetic reference to the reign of the Messiah may be found in it, and that, therefore, it must necessarily speak of the anointed king as living and acting, though not intending by that language to convey any extraordinary doctrine respecting the nature of a greater *Messiah* afterwards to be raised up, but already appointed in the Divine counsels.

Sect. xiii. Psa. xl. 6—10.

6. "Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in:
Then a body thou hast prepared for me.
Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou desirest not:
7. Then I said, Behold, I come!
In the roll of the book it is written concerning me,
8. To execute thy pleasure, O God, I do delight," &c.

"The terms of the passage," says Dr. S., "appear to require absolutely the sense of the abrogation of animal sacrifices by a person who declares that the very book which described those sacrifices had its superior reference to him, and that he himself would present the only sacrifice that should be worthy of Deity to accept. I must despair of ever acquiring consistent know-

ledge, or satisfaction on any subject of rational inquiry; I must give up the first principles of evidence as to prophecy and inspiration, and, renouncing all sober rules of interpretation, commit myself to the extravagance of fancy and arbitrary dictates,—if THIS be not a clear and characteristic description of the Messiah."

Again,

"That glorious Person is represented as, in a state of existence previous to his appearance among mortals, contemplating with supreme joy the designs of Divine benevolence, glowing with holy ardour to bear his part in the gracious plan, and ready to assume that human form, which in the appointed time would be prepared and adapted for this all-important design."—Scrip. Test. Vol. I. p. 325, second edition.

We read with astonishment such confident assertions, resting on so very slight a foundation, and cannot repress the reflection, that the defenders of popular opinions could not attach much importance to passages like this, unless driven to them, by the entire absence of all really satisfactory evidence.

In the second clause of ver. 6, Dr. S. adopts the reading of the ancient Greek version, "Then a body thou hast prepared for me," chiefly because it has been so quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The literal translation of the present Hebrew text is what is found in the Received Version: "Mine ears thou hast opened." There is no variation in the Hebrew MSS., and no ancient version, except those taken from the Greek, differs from the common reading; for Dr. S.'s remark, that there exist MSS. of the very ancient Syriac Version, having the reading "a body," is of no importance, since these MSS., written by Christians, may have been corrected to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and there is no good reason to doubt the genuineness of the printed Syriac text, which follows the Hebrew reading. Independently, then, of the quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews, no one would hesitate to prefer the reading of the present Hebrew copies. The Greek translation contains many strange blunders, and though of great interest and value, would not alone in a case of this kind be sufficient to shake our confidence in a reading which gives a good sense, and is supported by all other authorities. Many learned men suppose that the word "body," even in the Greek, is a later corruption, but for this we see no reason, as it has been shewn how, by mistaking a letter or two, they might have derived that sense from the Hebrew words, and it is not a solitary instance of their falling into such a mistake; but no critic would hesitate (setting aside the Epistle to the Hebrews) to adhere to the received text in the Psalm. The question then is, whether the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who, as a Jew acquainted with the Greek language, would be familiar with the LXX. Greek translation, and disposed to quote from it, was protected by his inspiration from following any error that might be found in it, and does by his authority establish a reading which would otherwise be without hesitation rejected. Now, we do not know who was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the ancient church differed greatly as to its value; but granting it the highest authority, the writer quotes the passage from the Psalm, not as prophetic, but in the way of application, as a suitable mode of expressing his doctrine. That doctrine, we doubt not, he received on sufficient authority. Grant that he had it by direct personal inspiration, (which if Paul was the writer was true, and may have been true if it was written by others to whom it has been ascribed,) yet is it to be supposed, that he not only received the doc-

trine, but also the mode of expressing it, or that the light he had obtained respecting the meaning and purpose of the ancient Scriptures extended to the correction of every error in the version of those Scriptures with which he was familiar? We can neither find that such inspiration as this was pretended to, nor can we perceive its utility. The writer of the Epistle, teaching what he knew (probably by personal inspiration) to be genuine Christian doctrine, quoted the Psalm in the form in which it was familiar to him, using its words to express the sentiment he wished to convey. That sentiment is the abolition of the sacrifices of the law, of which the death of Christ, in obedience to the will of God, described as the offering "of his body," was the sign and seal. But we can find nothing resembling Dr. Smith's doctrine in the Epistle, and much less is it to be extracted from the Psalm, which indeed we can see no pretence for considering as at all prophetic. The following, we apprehend, to be a fair translation of the principal verses quoted, which we request the reader to compare with that which we have given from Dr. Smith:

Ver. 6. "Sacrifice and meat-offering thou desirest not;
(My ears thou hast opened;) [i. e. thou hast made me willing to attend to thy instructions]
Burnt-offering and sin-offering thou requirest not.
7. Then I said, 'Lo, I come; [I am ready to hear and obey thy commands;]
In the roll of the book, it is prescribed to me,
8. 'To do what is acceptable to thee, O God, is my delight:
And thy law is within me.'"

WELLBELOVED'S *Bible*, Part VI.

Section xiv. Psalm xlv. 2—8. The important words are in ver. 6, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!"

The Psalm is considered as a prophetic address to the Messiah, who is therefore here called God, and the use made of the words in Hebrews i. 8, "But to the Son (he saith), Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," is regarded as establishing beyond all doubt the validity of this application. Some Unitarian expositors, as Mr. Belsham, adopt the translation, "God is thy throne," the support of thy throne, i. e. he will make thy dominion mighty and durable, which both the Hebrew of the Psalm and the Greek of the quotation in the Epistle will equally well bear, and which suits the connexion in both places: others suppose the word God to be here employed in an inferior sense. The prevailing and most probable opinion is, that the 45th Psalm was written on occasion of the marriage of Solomon with the daughter of the King of Egypt, and this opinion, as to its *primary* sense, is held by most of those who consider it as having a *secondary* reference to the Messiah and his kingdom, that is, by the great majority of Christian commentators. Some interpreters, indeed, of great learning, and whose opinions deserve much respect, have affirmed that the Psalm must be considered as primarily addressed to the Messiah, and is not properly applicable to Solomon or to any other person; but their chief arguments are drawn from the quotation in Heb. i. 8, (of which we shall speak presently,) and from the assumption of the point in dispute, that ver. 6 is an address to some individual as the Supreme God, whilst their application of other parts of the Psalm is figurative almost throughout, and in some instances extremely forced. The 9th and following verses may be explained *secondarily* of the church as the bride of the Messiah, but their direct and sole application in that sense is what the sober judgment of no unprejudiced reader can admit. The argu-

ment from the everlasting duration ascribed to the kingdom of the person addressed is of no weight, being a common oriental idiom: thus, for example, in Nathan's prophecy to David respecting Solomon, 1 Chron. xvii. 11—14: "I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will stablish his kingdom. He shall build me an house, (plainly shewing that Solomon is the person spoken of,) and *I will stablish his throne* FOR EVER. I will be his father, and he shall be my son; and I will not take my mercy away from him, as I took it from him that was before thee: but I will settle him in mine house and in my kingdom *for ever;* and *his throne shall be established for evermore.*" It is universally acknowledged that this magnificent, prophetic language was intended, and, according to the notions of the age and country, was well adapted, to express the promise of a long reign to Solomon, and of posterity to succeed him on his throne, but nothing more; and we cannot but consider it as going far to justify the sense, "*God* is thy throne, for ever and ever," in the passage under our consideration, by shewing how peculiarly God had promised to establish and support the throne of the prince to whom that passage, beyond all reasonable doubt, immediately referred; but supposing the common translation to be preferable, the use of the word *God*, in an inferior sense, is not unknown to Scripture, nor at variance with oriental idiom. It must be understood to mean (as Bishop Young has translated it) *prince*, and it is certain that what could with propriety be addressed to Solomon, could not be unsuitable to his great descendant, and could not possibly imply any thing inconsistent with the unrivalled *deity* and perfect *unity* of the Supreme Being; indeed, any such abuse of the words is guarded against by the language of ver. 7: "Therefore God, *thy God, hath anointed thee* with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows,*" words which, if they have any meaning at all, ascribed to the person addressed *inferiority, derived and dependent authority*, and *equality of rank* with some *human beings.*

Referring to Mr. Belsham's statement, "It is well known that the words of the original will equally well bear to be translated *God is thy throne*"—a statement which, after due deliberation, we have ventured to adopt in the preceding remarks, Dr. S. says, "It is not quite consistent with fairness in argument, for the learned writer roundly to assert as *well known*, what he could not but know to be extremely disputable, and to have been in fact generally objected to." There is nothing so plain that it may not be disputed, and Mr. B. did not say or mean that nobody had denied what he asserted, but he certainly neither did think, nor ought in reason to have thought, it *extremely disputable.* He was safe in his assertion, 1st, because he was directly supported by the authority of Enjedenus and Crellius, Grotius,* Dr. Samuel Clarke, Pierce, Sykes, J. G. Rosenmüller, and Wakefield,

* Dr. S. remarks, that Grotius "seems anxiously to avoid giving any *construction*, contenting himself with saying, "the *sense* is." Does Dr. S. then mean to insinuate that this great critic affirmed that to be the sense of a passage of Scripture which *he knew could not be derived from the words?* Such seems to be his meaning, but such a charge neither needs nor deserves an answer. Grotius gives a reason why he thinks that the word "God" must, in this place, be understood of the Supreme Being himself, and adds, "Sensus ergo est: Deus ipse est sedes tua perpetua." He perceived no difficulty in this construction: he considered the original words as ambiguous, and not seeing reason to admit that Christ could be called God in the highest and proper sense; having, besides, before observed that the Psalm primarily referred to Solomon, he thought the reason he had given for understanding the word God in its highest sense, a sufficient reason for not addressing it

not now to mention others, men certainly as competent to judge, and as little under the influence of prejudice, as any who have given an opinion on the subject; and 2dly, because, whilst the majority of commentators, adopting, in conformity with their own doctrinal views, the common construction, pass by this one without particular notice, those who have undertaken to give reasons against its grammatical propriety, have signally failed in their attempts.*

Dr. S.'s objections to the propriety of the figure, "God is thy throne," seem to us to be either altogether unfounded, or at least greatly exaggerated. God is spoken of as a *rock*, a *tower*, a *fortress*, a *shield*, a *refuge*: and we do not find much truth in the remark, that the protection or aid implied in these terms has more dignity than that implied in calling him the throne, i. e. some emblem of dominion of a creature. If we consider that the word *throne* is not to be understood literally as a seat, but stands for the sovereign power and dignity of which it is the symbol, and compare the passage with Numb. xviii. 20, where God says to the house of Aaron, "*I* am *thy part* and *thy inheritance*," I will provide for thee a suitable maintenance; Psa. xvi. 5, "Jehovah is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup," he allots to me and secures to me my portion; Psa. lxxiii. 26, "*God is my portion* for ever," he will provide for me, and to him I look for comfort; we cannot but perceive that to describe God as a throne, meaning the Giver and Upholder of its glory and dominion, is not inconsistent with the poetical style of the ancient Hebrews, and by no means deserves to be spoken of as irreverent, or as indicating the want of all correct feeling.

We do not decide in favour of Mr. Belsham's interpretation; we are in much doubt on the subject, and rather incline to favour the common translation, understanding "God" in the sense of "mighty prince;" but we have no doubt of the original words fully admitting the sense ascribed to them by Mr. B. and so many distinguished interpreters of Scripture: we think there is good reason for the inquiring mind to pause and hesitate between two highly probable explanations, and it only appears to us *certain* that the Psalm must have been originally an epithalamium addressed to some prince, (who is determined, with great probability, to have been Solomon,) and consequently that the words under consideration could not possibly have been designed to ascribe deity to the person addressed.

We proceed to consider the true character and intent of the quotation in

---

as a title to a created being. Dr. S. would, in like manner, detract from the value of the opinions on this point of Enjedin, Clarke, and Pierce: the former only says "the words will admit of this explication:" possunt sic commodè explicari. And this, we answer, is all that is wanted, as no one denies that they *may* be taken according to the other construction. Clarke, in a book written after his *Scripture Doctrine*, "follows the commonly-received construction;" but he does not retract his opinion that the other is perfectly allowable. Pierce only affirms, in a note, that it is *doubtful* which construction is preferable—i. e. precisely the sentiment for which he is quoted.

* The ambiguity of the Hebrew cannot be denied: the objection to rendering the Greek words, "God is thy throne," is taken from the article being found in the predicate of the proposition; but though not of common occurrence, there are exceptions to the ordinary practice in this respect, and Mr. Yates, in his Vindication of Unitarianism, (p. 113,) has produced an instance of a precisely similar construction, which sufficiently justifies that translation:

Psa. lxxiii. 26: Ἡ μερις μου ὁ Θεος εις τον αιωνα.

Psa. xlv. 6; Heb. i. 8: Ὁ θρονος σου ὁ Θεος εις τον αιωνα.

the Epistle to the Hebrews, and our remarks will extend to the two passages which form the subjects of Dr. S.'s fifteenth and seventeenth sections, which are applied to the Messiah solely on the authority of the author of the Epistle.

Whoever was its author, which must probably always remain a matter of extreme uncertainty, there can be no doubt that this Epistle was written by a sincere and pious Christian before the destruction of Jerusalem; and from the general diffusion of miraculous gifts in that first period of the church, and his having been a person of sufficient importance to offer advice to others, we see no reason to doubt that he was one who had experienced personal divine communications, or displayed supernatural powers. What he wrote, then, cannot but be read by us with interest and respect, as being sure to contain just views of Christian doctrine, and valuable instructions which we may all apply to our own improvement. But we know not upon what authority any one can affirm that he made, or was entitled to make, any pretensions to divine guidance *as a writer*, and we think there is scarcely any portion of the sacred volume which requires to be read with more caution, lest we should pervert the meaning of the author through ignorance of the circumstances under which he wrote, and the customs or opinions of the age, and of the people whom he addressed. We are not bound always to assume, nor can we in all cases consistently with our own reason and knowledge admit, the soundness of the *arguments* employed even by writers to whose authority, as religious instructors, we implicitly defer, and this distinction has been often pointed out by learned and judicious divines. Thus Bishop Burnet:

"When divine writers argue upon any point, we are always bound to believe the conclusions that their reasonings end in, as parts of divine revelation; but we are not bound to be able to make out, or even to assent to, all the premises made use of by them in their whole extent; unless it appears plainly that they affirm the premises expressly as they do the conclusions proved by them."

And Paley,

"In reading the apostolic writings we should carefully distinguish between their *doctrines* and their *arguments*. Their doctrines came to them by revelation, properly so called; yet in propounding these doctrines in their writings or discourses, they were wont to illustrate, support, and enforce them by such analogies, arguments, and considerations, as their own thoughts suggested."

Again,

"St. Paul, I am apt to believe, has been sometimes accused of inconclusive reasoning, by our mistaking that for reasoning which was only intended for illustration. He is not to be read as a man whose own persuasion of the truth of what he taught always or solely depended on the views under which he represents it in his writings. Taking for granted the certainty of his doctrine as resting upon the revelation that had been imparted to him, he exhibits it *frequently* to the conceptions of his readers under images and *allegories*, in which if an *analogy* may be perceived, or even sometimes a *poetic resemblance* be found, it is all, perhaps, that is required."

Now, there is no part of the New Testament where considerations such as these are so much required as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and there is no subject which demands more caution and care, if we wish not to be greatly misled, and to pervert the authorities to which we appeal, than the use made of passages from the Old Testament. The Jews, in our Lord's

time, considered the greatest part of their Scriptures as applicable in a secondary and mystical sense to their expected Messiah. The Christian writers often argued with them from their own concessions, or illustrated and recommended what they taught by expressing it in the words of the Old Testament. The Epistle to the Hebrews is altogether an attempt to render the gospel interesting to Jews by an application to its truths (much in the manner of the applications of Scripture which are now so common among most sects) of the words of the ancient sacred books, and by finding analogies between them and the principles or ceremonies of the law.

In this light it has been considered by some of the most distinguished theologians, and thus only it appears to us that we can obtain an intelligible and rational view of its character and purpose.

"Long before our Saviour's time," says Dr. Hey, late Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, "it seems probable that the Jews had some sort of traditions; traditional narratives, prophecies, or modes of interpreting prophecies; modes of arranging, construing, and applying the Psalms, and other parts of Holy Writ; methods of *allegorizing;* all these our Saviour and his apostles seem to have so far *adopted* as to *make use of them* in reasoning with the Jews."

Le Clerc, in his edition of Hammond's Paraphrase and Notes, says, (Heb. ix. 16,)

"All the principles of Christian doctrine which the author of this Epistle defends, are most true, and may be proved from other parts of Scripture; but the method by which he illustrates them, is manifestly conformed to the custom of those times, as we see it in Philo, whose works abound in this sort of accommodations of passages of Scripture, and in reasonings derived from them, in which there is no regard paid to the grammatical sense, nor is any thing else attended to but the truth of the principle thus illustrated."

This passage is quoted with approbation by Rosenmüller; the same principle is defended by Sykes; and Paley's opinion may be gathered from what he says of the epistle of Barnabas:

"It is in its subject, and general composition, *much like the Epistle to the Hebrews; an allegorical application* of divers passages of the Jewish history, of their law and ritual, to those parts of the Christian dispensation *in which the author perceived a resemblance.*"—(Evidences of Christianity, B. iii. Ch. v.)

But although we do not admit the Epistle to the Hebrews as an authority with respect to the original sense or prophetic character of the portions of ancient Scripture which it quotes, it should still, according to the principles we have laid down, be authoritative in favour of the Christian doctrines which *by means of these quotations* it conveys, and if it applies unreservedly to Christ the names God and Lord, (representing *Jehovah,)* there is at least the testimony of the Christian writer, if not of the passages from the Old Testament, to the deity of our Saviour. This is readily granted: but the very means which the writer employed to attract and conciliate those whom he immediately addressed have thrown such obscurity over his style that, perhaps unavoidably, we, in these distant times, are influenced in our mode of understanding him by the opinions we have formed on the great subjects of Christian doctrine from the study of other parts of Scripture. We have endeavoured to the utmost of our power to divest ourselves of prejudice, and to consider what is the most natural, consistent, and suitable sense: we are ourselves well satisfied that we have chosen the right interpretation, but we have little hope of convincing those who come to the subject impressed with

a firm belief of doctrines which we do not find in Scripture, but which the ambiguity of some of the language here employed may naturally enough seem to them to favour.

The first proposition of the writer seems to be the superiority of Christ's office to that of all previous messengers of God's will to his creatures, which he illustrates by fanciful applications of passages from the Old Testament, availing himself for this purpose of the double meaning of the word "*angel*," sometimes applied to *human*, sometimes to spiritual messengers; sometimes to the elements executing the purposes of the Almighty; sometimes to an order of superior intelligences ever ready to fulfil his commands. We shall give what we apprehend to be the sense of the passage (ch i. 4—14) which contains the quotations now under our consideration. "Being made so much better than those messengers," (the prophets by whom God had previously spoken,) "inasmuch as he hath by inheritance obtained" (acquired, as belonging naturally to his office) "a more excellent name than they" (they being only called messengers or servants, his superiority being marked by the name of *Son*). "For unto which of those messengers, said he, at any time, 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee?' And again, 'I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a Son.'"—(An appeal to the prevalent Jewish opinion that these words, taken from Ps. ii. and 2 Sam. vii. 14, were applicable in their highest sense to the Messiah, an opinion which, so far as relates to the last-mentioned passage, we can have no difficulty in pronouncing to be erroneous.) "And when he introduces again the first-begotten into the world," (a reference to the resurrection,) "he saith, 'Let all the angels of God worship him'" (rather, "do homage to him." It is somewhat doubtful whence these words are taken. Dr. S. considers them as a loose quotation from Ps. xcvii. 7. "The difference of the words," he says, "is immaterial to the sense, and is not greater than occurs in some instances of passages from the Old Testament introduced into the New." It is possible he may be right. The literal translation from the Hebrew in that passage is, "Worship him, all ye *Gods;*" but the LXX. render it αγγελοι, *angels*. It is not certain whether the original here intends by "Gods," *princes*, *magistrates*, or *prophets;* but there is little reason to suppose that it can mean *angels* in our sense of that word. Whoever they are, it is clear that they are called upon to praise Jehovah, and there is no pretence for supposing any reference of the Psalm to the Messiah; nor will the opinion of certain Jews, at a period when they were disposed to refer every thing in their Scriptures to this expected prince, and which applies equally to all the neighbouring Psalms, be thought of much importance. Our author's attempt to explain the *introduction* of the *first-begotten into the world*, as implied in the Psalm, is, we should think, too far-fetched and fanciful to satisfy even those who are most willing to be led by him. But it is upon the whole the most probable supposition, adopted by Mr. Belsham after Sykes, that the words in the Epistle are taken from the LXX. version of Deut. xxxii. 43, where they are found exactly, though there is nothing corresponding in the purest Hebrew copies, or in the other ancient versions; and if we suppose the clause not to be genuine as a part of the passage in Deuteronomy, that is no reason why it may not have been quoted and applied by the author of the epistle, finding it, as we have no reason to doubt that he did, in his Greek copy, from whence he has drawn all his quotations.*

* Dr. Smith thinks "its variations in the different MSS. of the LXX. itself afford a presumption against its genuineness" (i. e. as a part of the original LXX.). May

Mr. Belsham agrees with Dr. Sykes in supposing that the *homage from all the messengers of God*, is, in the passage of Deut., required to be paid to the *chosen people*, whose father God is called in this very chapter, and who are elsewhere in the book of Exodus collectively spoken of as God's *first-born son;* that the *introducing again into the world* is the restoration of their prosperity after their afflictions, which is the subject of this part of the Song of Moses, and that the application of the words to the resurrection of Christ is an accommodation. Our doubt is, whether the writer of the epistle makes any reference at all to the original connexion of the words he quotes. He may mean merely, that by the resurrection of Christ he was so gloriously exalted, that those words of Scripture might well be applied to him, "Let all the messengers of God do homage to him." When he introduceth again the first-begotten (from the dead) into the world, he saith, the Scripture saith, i. e. we may apply the words of Scripture, "Let all the messengers of God do homage to him"). "And concerning these messengers *the Scripture* saith, 'Who maketh his messengers winds, and his ministers a flame of fire.'" (It represents them as mere servants fulfilling his commands, like the winds and the lightning. The quotation is from the LXX. version of the 104th Ps. The proper translation of the Hebrew seems to be, "who maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire, i. e. lightnings, his servants." The author of the epistle means no more than that the condition of previous messengers, as compared with that of the Son, might be expressed in these words of Scripture.) "But concerning the Son it saith, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,'" &c., (whichever construction of the words we adopt, the person referred to is spoken of as of exalted rank, and as distinguished by the favour of his God, treated not as a servant, but with distinguished honour, the passage being reputed among the Jews as a prophecy of the Messiah, and capable of being really so understood, though originally applied to Solomon, was the more to the writer's purpose,) "and 'Thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundations of the earth,'" &c. (The 102nd Ps., from which this passage is taken, cannot, without extreme violence, be considered as applicable to Christ, and no authority possessed by the writer of this epistle could cause those who are not blinded by prejudice to understand it so. Some have supposed the words to be by accommodation employed to express, still more strongly than the preceding quotation had done, the permanence and glory of Christ's kingdom, and to ascribe to him a new and moral creation; but this is forced; and besides it is very unlikely, as Mr. Belsham justly observes, that any writer, addressing himself to Jews, should "presume to hold that language concerning a prophet, however dignified, which, in their sacred writings, was uniformly appropriated to the Deity." Much more probable is the interpretation of Emlyn and others, that "the immutability of God is here declared as a pledge of the immutability of the kingdom of Christ." "The God last mentioned," says Emlyn, "was Christ's God, who had anointed him; and the *author* thereupon, addressing himself to this God, breaks out into the celebration of his *power*, and especially his *unchangeable duration;* which he dwells upon as what he principally cites the

---

it not be more justly said, looking at Dr. S.'s own comparison of the present Hebrew with the Aldine, Vatican, and Alexandrine editions of the LXX., that the parallelism between the two first sentences, one of which is retained in the Hebrew, the other in the Aldine Greek, is favourable to the genuineness of both, the same sort of parallelism being found in the following clauses, and that the difference between the Vatican and Alexandrine—"be strong in him"—"strengthen them," proves the existence of an original in another language, of which both these are translations?

text for; in order, I conceive, to prove the stability of the Son's kingdom before spoken of."—Emlyn's Works, Vol. II. p. 340. This deserves attention, but we are disposed to think that this passage should rather be connected with what follows than with what precedes it. The writer quotes a remarkable declaration of the power, majesty, and immutability of God, and then argues in confirmation of what he had before said, that this great Being condescended to place the Son at his right hand, to exalt him and cause him to triumph, whilst other messengers were but ministers of his will for the service of those who were "to become heirs of salvation,"—to be admitted to enjoy the blessings of the Gospel.) "But to which of those messengers, said he, at any time, 'Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool'?" (Applying a clause from the 2nd Ps., which, though originally relating to David, was believed to have a secondary application to the Messiah.) "Are not they all ministering spirits" (probably *ministering winds*—servants swift as winds, in allusion to ver. 7) "sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?"

We have given what we consider as the most consistent and satisfactory interpretation of the passage: respecting the author's mode of quoting and applying texts from the Old Testament, we feel no hesitation. With somewhat less confidence, though upon the whole with a feeling that the evidence for it decidedly preponderates, we follow Wakefield, Simson, and Belsham, in explaining "angels" as here meaning the ancient prophets. Dr. S.'s objection to this, from the change in the sense of the word in ch. ii. 5, we do not think of much weight as regards such a writer as the author of this epistle; but the comparison of Heb. ii. 2, with Gal. iii. 19, and (which reference he omits) Acts vii. 53, if those passages are to be understood according to the general opinion of commentators, apparently supported by Jewish traditions, is much more to the purpose; and as we have doubts on the subject, we request our readers to observe, that admitting, throughout, the translation "angels," and understanding the passage to affirm the superiority of Christ to spiritual beings employed in accomplishing the Divine purposes under the former dispensations, it is still the superiority of Christ's *office*, and the dignity to which God *has exalted him*, which are spoken of, and no inference can be thence fairly drawn respecting his nature.

Undoubtedly, if the New Testament distinctly teaches the Deity of Christ, the allusions of the writer to the Hebrews will be understood as confirming that doctrine. But the present question is, whether the doctrine is taught in the Old Testament, and what we hope we have proved is, that the passages treated of in Dr. S.'s xivth, xvth, and xvith sections, neither in themselves appear to teach it, nor are proved to contain it by the use made of them in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The xviith section is on Ps. cx., usually regarded as prophetic of the Messiah, and quoted by our Lord himself, to confound the Jews by the acknowledgment here made by David of his superiority. We cannot, however, perceive that this Psalm contains any thing which exalts the Messiah in any other sense than as all Christians believe that he is exalted. That, although the descendant of David, he was much greater than David, and might properly in prophetic vision be called by him Lord, and be represented as *his superior, his sovereign*, is universally acknowledged. Even the Jews would not have denied this. But the difficulty proposed was, how could David address, as his Lord, one not then existing, his own descendant in distant times? The Jews had no answer ready; the Orthodox now answer, because Christ, being God, then existed in heaven, as was well known to David.

In opposition to them is Mr. Belsham's judicious note: "The proper answer seems to be, that the Psalmist was transported in vision to the age of the Messiah, and speaks as though he were contemporary with Christ. This mode of writing was not unusual with the prophets." The Calm Inquirer's note does not then "proceed on a wrong assumption of the point under consideration," but is a solid answer to the argument usually drawn from our Lord's question in favour of his superiority of nature, and we do not see that Dr. Smith has made the case any stronger. The priesthood, according to the order of Melchisedek, of course refers to the office and work, not to the nature of the Messiah, and as explained by the writer to the Hebrews, implies nothing which Unitarians do not fully believe. It only remains for us to notice Dr. Smith's gloss on the fifth verse of the Psalm:

"The Lord (Adonai, which he afterwards observes is 'the name appropriated to the living and true God') is on thy right hand: (the address is now turned to Jehovah:) He smiteth kings in the day of his wrath," &c.

He would have us understand, that "the Lord" here is the same person spoken of by the Psalmist as "my Lord" in ver. 1st, and that he is here distinguished by a name peculiarly appropriated to the Supreme God. The reason, we presume, for this construction is, that "the Lord" is here said to be "on the right hand;" whereas in the first verse we find "Jehovah said *to my Lord*, Sit thou at my right hand." "The Lord," therefore, in the second place, must signify the same person who was before placed at God's right hand, and the words addressed to Jehovah who called him there.

In opposition to this we observe, that as the whole of the rest of the Psalm (and manifestly both the preceding and following clauses) is addressed to the great personage who is its subject, it is most unreasonable and unnatural to suppose these few words to be differently addressed, and there is no occasion, as we have elsewhere the very expression here employed of God *being at the right hand of those whom he favoured*, and it is a different phrase from that in the first verse. Ps. xvi. 8: "Because he (Jehovah) *is at my right hand*, I shall not be moved." Ps. cix. 31: "He (Jehovah) shall *stand at the right hand* of the poor, to save him from those that condemn his soul." It is then evident, that ver. 5 is not addressed to Jehovah, but speaks of him as supporting that great personage whose exaltation had been described; and to put this beyond doubt, the fact is, that for *Adonai*, a great many MSS. have *Jehovah*, which there is every reason to believe to be the true reading, and which is adopted by Dathe.

Section xviii. Isa. vi. 1—5. This passage relates a vision of Isaiah, by means of which he was commissioned to the prophetic office, and which consisted in a visible manifestation of the Divine presence, so that he said (ver. 5), "Mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts." In John xii. 41, after quoting two passages from Isaiah, the last of them, respecting the obstinacy of the Jews in rejecting Christ, taken from this chapter, the Apostle writes, "These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spake of him," the person spoken of being apparently Christ, whence it has been concluded that Christ was Jehovah. The argument is generally employed by the defenders of the deity of Christ, and has been variously replied to by different Unitarian writers. The truth is, that if we believe on other grounds in the identity of Christ with Jehovah, this passage will appear to us to confirm that opinion, but a reference of this kind, which might so naturally and easily have been made without intending to teach such a doctrine, will never convince any one who finds that doctrine repugnant to the general tenor of

Scripture. Dr. S. speaks severely of the Unitarian interpretations, as "invented in order to serve a system," "evasive, arbitrary, incongruous, and inadequate to the intention." The first charge means that a full conviction, arising from the careful study of other parts of Scripture, that Christ and Jehovah were distinct beings, disposed the minds of Unitarian commentators to seek and accept a sense of the words, not implying their identity: which may be true, but is far from being a reproach to them, or an objection to the interpretation. The other charges are no more than unsupported assertions expressing the *feeling* of a writer on one side of the question. We quote an expression of feeling on the other side, from the note on Isa. vi., of the learned and excellent Michael Dodson. He gives the words of Bishops Lowth and Pearce, affirming Christ to be called Jehovah, and goes on thus:

"How absurd! Is Christ, who suffered death on the cross, the king JEHOVAH, God of hosts? Did the seraphims address themselves to him when they cried, saying,

> Holy, holy, holy JEHOVAH, God of hosts!
> The whole earth is full of his glory!

"It is wonderful, indeed, that such learned and good men should have satisfied themselves in shutting their eyes against the clearest light; and in thus offering to the world an interpretation which they must have known to be liable to great objections. How easy and natural is the interpretation of John vii. 41, given by Dr. Clarke, in his 'Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity'!"

He then gives the passage from Clarke, whom Unitarians in general follow:

"The true meaning is; when Esaias saw the glory of God the Father revealing to him the coming of Christ, he then saw the glory of him who was to come in the glory his Father (Matt. xvi. 27). Esaias, in beholding the glory of God, and in receiving from him a revelation of the coming of Christ, saw, (i. e. foresaw) the glory of Christ, just as Abraham saw (that is, foresaw) his day, and was glad."—Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, No. 597.

The reader will find some valuable observations in Dr. Carpenter's Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, third edition, p. 133. It is highly probable that the words, "these things said Isaiah," refer to the passage quoted from Isa. liii. The dogmatism of Dr. Smith admits of no reply. The impartial inquirer will probably consider this as one of those passages, the just interpretation of which must be determined by our convictions as to the general tenor of Scripture, and which is too ambiguous to be safely appealed to as a *proof* of any doctrine respecting our Lord's person.

On Dr. S.'s xixth section (Isaiah vii. 14) we need make no remark, as he himself maintains, that, most probably, the original Hebrew word does not necessarily denote virginity, but might be applied to a young woman lately married; "that the definitive appellation, 'the Virgin,' was at the moment applied to a known individual, who, at the proper time afterwards, became the mother of a distinguished child;" and that the name Emanuel is a "*commemorative* and *descriptive* title. It does not appear to have been intended as a proper name." "In what I suppose," he says, "to have been the primary and inferior reference, it would express no more than that, in the existing distresses of Judea and Jerusalem, God would be WITH THEM as their Almighty protector."

In this sense, no doubt, whether originally prophetic of him or not, it is

applicable to the Messiah, and therefore, in denying any inference from it as to the divinity of his person, we are justified by Dr. S. himself.

The argument in the xxth section (on Isa. viii. 13, 14) is most extraordinary:

"The evident design of this passage is to point out the True and Eternal God as the author of safety and deliverance from imminent danger; that it is the duty of men to honour him and rely upon him in this capacity; and that those who refuse to do so will be the objects of his awful displeasure, involved by their own unbelief and disobedience in the more terrible ruin. The middle clauses are introduced by the Apostles Peter and Paul, (Rom. ix. 33, 1 Pet. ii. 8,) with an explicit application to Christ. There is also a conformity of sentiment well worthy of being observed, with other declarations of the New Testament, on the opposite effects of obedient dependence on Jesus as the only Saviour and rejection of him."—Vide Luke ii. 34; 1 Cor. i. 23.

Hence Dr. S. infers that Christ must have been the Jehovah who was to be the object of confidence and reverence to his people.

Isa. viii. 13, as he renders the words,

> "To Jehovah of hosts himself, pay holy homage,
> Even him your fear, and him your dread."

The fact is, that the passage in Rom. ix. 33, is a mixed quotation, and merely in the way of accommodation, from this place and Isa. xxviii. 16; the form and chief substance being taken from the latter, but the expression "stumbling-stone and rock of offence" derived from this. 1 Pet. ii. 6 is a quotation of Isa. xxviii. 16, and vers. 7 and 8 contain an imperfect quotation of the words in this place mixed with Psa. cxviii. 22, and evidently only accommodated. The other passages referred to merely contain similar figurative language, which may have been suggested by what is here said, but will not afford the slightest ground for supposing that the subjects must be the same. In Isa. xxviii. 16, to which alone there is the appearance of appealing as an authority in the texts referred to, it is Jehovah who *lays the stone*, and consequently the person so designated must be distinct from, and inferior to, him.

We now come to a very important passage generally quoted by writers in defence of the deity of Christ, and upon which the advocates of Unitarianism have also frequently expressed their views, so that we may confine ourselves to a few remarks on our author's mode of treating it. Section xxi. Isa. ix. 5, 6:

> "For a child is born to us:
> A son is given to us:
> And the sovereignty is upon his shoulder;
> And his name is called Wonderful, Counsellor,
> God the mighty, Everlasting, Prince of peace:
> To the extent of [his] sovereignty and to [his] peace [shall be] no end,
> Upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom,
> To fix it and to establish it, in judgment and in righteousness
> From henceforth and for ever."

The important points are the epithets "God the mighty" and "Everlasting." Now we observe, that though Rosenmüller *interprets* the word as meaning GOD, he gives, even in his second edition, *fortis* as the proper sense of אֵל, (which seems to have been the way it was understood by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion,) noting also that the term is applied to Nebuchadnezzar (Ezek. xxxi. 11); and Gesenius, as well as Bauer, trans-

lates אל-גבור "strong hero," for which Dr. S. acknowledges that he has given a *weighty reason*, though *he* thinks it is *outweighed* by another consideration. But even not to press the argument from the use of the very same words in the plural אלי גבורים for *mighty heroes* (Ezek. xxxii. 21), and admitting that the form אל, when not used collectively, was appropriated to express deity, yet as its primitive meaning is the *mighty one* or the *ruler*, and it is not a peculiar name of the true and only God, there would be nothing at all surprising in its being used in poetry as an epithet of a mighty prince, whose power and greatness the writer was prophetically celebrating. Rosenmüller gives the following extract from the letter of a Persian king of a later age: "Chosroes, king of kings, sovereign of potentates, lord of the nations, *prince of peace*, saviour of men, in the estimation of gods a man, good, *eternal;* in the estimation of men *a god, most illustrious, most glorious;* conqueror rising with the sun, and lending his eyes to the night." We may here make allowance, in the spirit of Rosenmüller's caution, for some progress of the fashion of employing such appellations, and yet find enough to justify our interpreting all the titles in the text under consideration as fit to be applied to a royal and distinguished personage, without any reference to a nature different from that of other men, and this without altering the present Hebrew text or the generally-received construction of the words.

Where Dr. S. has the epithet "Everlasting," there are in the Hebrew two words which may be literally rendered "father of the age to come," as they are by the LXX. He maintains, indeed, that עד signifies "*eternity;*" but this he cannot establish by any good evidence.

"Enjedin," says our author, speaking of the manner in which different interpreters have treated this text, "*observes deep silence on this whole passage.*" Truly he does so: to him Dr. S. might without any want of candour have attributed in this instance "the silence of *death*," (Scrip. Test. p. 185, second edit. and our remarks on that place,) as it is well known that his work (which is posthumous) only wanted for its completion notes on the Prophets, when death interrupted his labours. Dr. S. might have perceived that not this text in particular, but all the prophetic books are passed by in his notes, or he might have read in the dedication, "Imperfectum quidem opus. Quoniam absolutâ locorum Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis dogma extruitur explicatione, cum Vetus Testamentum aggressus eo usque processisset, ut solummodo prophetæ restarent, in medio opere ceu servus fidelis et vigilans, a Deo ad lætiora est avocatus, et antequam cursum absolvisset bravio donatus;"* but he wished it to appear that Enjedin was unable by any contrivance to evade the force of the passage, and he did not seek far for any other way of explaining his silence.†

---

* "An *imperfect* work indeed. For, when, having completed the explanation of those passages of the New Testament from which the doctrine of the Trinity is derived, he had applied himself to the Old Testament, and had proceeded so far that only the *prophets* remained, in the midst of his labours, being found like a faithful and watchful servant, he was called away by God to a happier state, and before he had finished the course, received the prize of victory."—Enjedini, Explicationes locorum, Epistola dedicatoria.

† With respect to the primary or, perhaps, entire reference of the passage to Hezekiah, the admission of which would put an end at once to any argument from it respecting the nature of Christ, we would refer to the papers by the Rev. Robert Wallace, of Chesterfield, in the Monthly Repository, (Old Series,) Vol. XIX. for 1824. This gentleman maintains, with much force of argument, that the prophecy was fulfilled in Hezekiah.

Section xxiii. Isaiah xl. 1—3, 9—11. What God, the Lord Jehovah, is said to do in this passage is attributed by our author to Christ, because what is said of *preparing a way for* JEHOVAH, is in the New Testament applied to John, the forerunner of our Lord. Matt. iii. 3; John i. 23; Luke i. 76, 16:

"To rebut this conclusion," (viz. that the Messiah is the Lord Jehovah,) says Dr. S., "it is asserted that 'John was the forerunner of the Lord their God, by being the forerunner of Jesus, the great messenger of God to mankind.' It must be confessed that this interpretation is not destitute of apparent reasons, but after weighing the arguments on each side, I acknowledge that the evidence in favour of the other interpretation seems to me to preponderate."

It would seem, then, that in this instance Dr. S. does not consider his own case *very* strong, and as he acknowledges that the prophecy in its primary sense predicted "the deliverance of the sons of Judah from their mournful slavery in Chaldæa," consequently that it was, so far as concerned that primary sense, "fulfilled in a series of providential occurrences, without any thing properly miraculous," it is truly extraordinary that he should not consider the manifestations of Divine power and goodness in the miracles and doctrines of Christ as a sufficient accomplishment, without looking for any reference to his person. The attempt to argue from our Lord's application to himself of the same image of the *good Shepherd*, which the prophet employs to represent the care of Jehovah for his chosen people, is strange, and can hardly need refutation.

"Moses and David in the sacred writings," says our author, "and other chieftains in the oldest records of Gentile language and manners, are called the *shepherds* of their people. But it is to the *distinguishing* and exalted manner in which this appellation and its attributes are given to Christ, that the attention of the serious reader is invited."

Our Lord applies the image somewhat particularly, beautifully representing it by means of his dying for the good of mankind, and hinting at the call of the Gentiles, ("other sheep I have, which are not of this fold, them also I must bring,") as well as indicating the grand doctrine which he came to reveal in the words, "I give unto them eternal life." But Cyrus and the Jewish princes and rulers, as well as Moses and David, are compared to shepherds in the Old Testament, and the case of the bad as well as of the good shepherd is minutely applied, nor could any image be more natural. Any thing *distinguishing* and *exalted* in the manner in which the appellation is given to Christ, either belongs of necessity to the character of his mission or exists only in our author's fancy. His own note, where he suggests as a possible objection, "that our Lord follows up this style of sovereignty with expressions of subordination and dependency," is a sufficient answer to him; for the remark respecting *official* subordination united with the possession of "*Divine* dignity and power," if it were not a mere quibble, would at least be in its application to the present purpose a gross *petitio principii*. What might we not prove if the use of the same image in two instances were to be taken as a sign of the identity of the subjects!

Section xxv. Isa. xlv. 21—25. The pretence for supposing this passage to relate to Christ, and hence that he is called *Jehovah, God, the Righteous, the Saviour*, is thus stated by Dr. S.:

"To urge the consideration that 'we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ,' the Apostle Paul undeniably cites and argues from this pas-

sage; 'It is written, *As I live saith the Lord, unto me every knee shall bow; and every tongue shall render acknowledgment to God;* so then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.' (Rom. xiv. 4.) That here is an intended application of the passage to Christ is at least corroborated by another reference of the Apostle, '*That in the name of Jesus every knee may bow, of beings in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and that every tongue may acknowledge that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*'" (Phil. ii. 10, 11.)

From Dr. S.'s own pages we take the sufficient answer to this argument, and we should have no fear, without saying a word more, of leaving the matter "to the *reflecting and candid reader*."

"The interpretation proposed by Faustus Socinus, and generally adopted by his followers, is perspicuously stated by Dr. Priestley. 'The judgment-seat of Christ, and that of God, are the same, not because Christ is God, but because he acts in the name and by the authority of God, which is fully expressed when it is said, that God will judge all the world by Jesus Christ; so that being judged by Christ and by God is in effect the same thing.' (Priestley's Notes on Scripture, Vol. IV. p. 330.) By this gratuitous assertion the difficulty is evaded; but whether it is not advanced to serve the purpose, whether it is not far-fetched, while the other sense is near and obvious, and whether it duly comports with the terms and scope of the passage, and with the argument of the citation—the reflecting and candid reader will judge."

The Scriptures speak in some places of God judging the world, in others, of our all appearing before the judgment-seat of Christ, and again of God judging the world *by that man whom he hath ordained.* Passages of the latter kind, preventing the possibility of the two former being taken as proving the identity of God and Christ, leave us no alternative but to say that "the judgment of Christ and of God are the same, because Christ acts in the name and by the authority of God." Yet this is called a *gratuitous* assertion. The explanation, it seems, is advanced *to serve a purpose:* the same *may be said* of every explanation as easily, and of none with more appearance of justice than of those contained in Dr. S.'s volume: it is an accusation of prejudice (for we will not suppose that artifice is insinuated)—prejudice, from which every one thinks himself free, and which each attributes to his opponent. *Far-fetched* often has reference only to the established associations of the person using the term, as *obvious* may only signify what readily occurs to him, having his mind preoccupied with a theory. It is clear that no one would have applied the original passage to our Lord, but for the Apostle's quotation: let us inquire then what was *his* meaning. He is urging those whom he addresses not to indulge in mutual censures, from the consideration of the future judgment to which they would all equally be called, and for which it would become them better to prepare, "since we must all present ourselves before the tribunal of Christ; for it is written, *As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall acknowledge God.* So then every one of us must give an account of himself to God." The Apostle quotes the words of the prophet as declaring that all should be judged. To shew that the judgment of God and of Christ are the same, is necessary to the sense of the passage: this is done satisfactorily by observing that God judges *through Christ;* it is not done satisfactorily by affirming that Christ is God, because that assertion is inconsistent with the declaration that "God will judge the world *by that man whom he hath appointed.*" But has Dr. S. never noticed, or does he regard as insignificant, a various reading in Rom. xiv. 10, where, for "we

shall all stand before the judgment-seat *of Christ*," a not inconsiderable number of copies read—" *of God:*" which, if admitted, would at once put an end to his argument? We are hardly prepared, as Mr. Belsham has done in his Translation of the Epistles, to introduce this reading into the text, but we cannot do less than pronounce it very probably true, and there ought to be little importance attached to an argument which rests on the correctness of *one* of two readings in so very doubtful a case. Our interpretation of Paul's meaning suits equally well to either.*

The next Section (numbered, like the preceding, xxv. by an error continued from the first edition) relates to the expression Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, xxxiii. 15, 16, " Jehovah our righteousness." The Unitarian interpretation, also adopted by some " who have no prepossession in favour of Antitrinitarian doctrines," and by the best of the Jewish commentators, is, that the title is given not as a personal appellative, but as a descriptive name, like Immanuel, Isa. vii. 14; Maher-shalal-hash-baz, Isa. viii. 1; Ariel, Isa. xxix. 1; Magor-Missabib, Jer. xx. 3; El-Elohe-Israel, *God, the God of Israel*, the name of an altar, Gen. xxxiii. 20; Jehovah-nissi, *Jehovah my banner*, Exod. xvii. 15, an altar so called by Moses; Jehovah-shalom, *Jehovah of peace*, Judges vi. 29, an altar so named by Gideon, because God said to him, " Peace be to thee;" and Jehovah-Shammah, *Jehovah is there*, Ezek. xlviii. 35, the name of the predicted city. Many personal appellatives among the Hebrews were constructed on the same principle, as Elijah, *my God Jah;* Zedekiah, the *righteousness of Jah;* Hiel, *the living God*, 1 Kings xvi. 34, the name of a Bethelite who rebuilt Jericho. That the name *Jehovah our righteousness*, meaning " Jehovah will give us justification through him, or in his time," should be used as descriptive of the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, can seem strange to no one, whatever view of the nature of those blessings, and the person of him through whom they were bestowed, he may adopt. Dr. S., whilst acknowledging that " if the person of the Messiah were indubitably ascertained to be only human," which we think that it is by abundant evidence, " this appellation would be merely a descriptive proposition," maintains that " there is a consideration which especially belongs to the very phrase of this passage," corroborating the evidence for considering the name as strictly expressing the nature of Christ, which he supposes to be furnished by other parts of Scripture. This consideration is, that " *righteousness* (or justification) is the capital blessing of the gospel," and " is most definitively attributed to Jesus Christ. Every other righteousness is disowned and rejected in comparison with his." We

---

* Griesbach places Θεϑ in his inner margin with the secondary mark of probability (which he explains to mean that the reading is not to be despised, and is worthy of farther examination, yet inferior to the received). It is found in the principal MSS. of the Western recension, as well as in the Alexandrian MS., which, in the epistles, more generally exhibits the Alexandrine recension. Griesbach prefers the reading of the received text, as belonging both to the Alexandrine and Byzantine recensions, and probably because he thought that Θεϑ might have been written for the sake of consistency with the following verse. We submit, with all due respect for so acute and impartial a judge, that it is more probable Χριϛϑ was written instead of Θεϑ, in imitation of 2 Cor. v. 10, Τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τϑ βήματος τῦ Χριϛῦ; that the Western recension, however much to be distrusted respecting changes dependent on the mere substitution of letters, or respecting additions to the text, is less than either of the others to be suspected of a *critical* change; and that the Common or Byzantine text can in a case of this kind add nothing to the authority of the Alexandrine recension, so that the balance of probability *rather inclines* in favour of the reading Θεϑ.

should think this the very reason why the promise of righteousness or justification from God through him should be expressed, as being of eminent importance, by a descriptive name. But, perhaps, Dr. S. means by justification being *definitively attributed to* HIM, that it is attributed to him rather than to God the Father, that it *originated* with him, and is his peculiar work. Let us then see how far the passages to which he himself refers in the New Testament agree with this notion: Philipp. iii. 9, "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is OF GOD by faith." 1 Cor. i. 30, "Christ Jesus, who OF GOD is made unto us wisdom, and *righteousness*, and sanctification;" add 2 Cor. v. 21, "For he hath made him to be sin (treated him as a sinner) for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made *the righteousness of* GOD in him," might obtain justification from God through him. It is strange to say, in the face of these passages, that the righteousness or justification belongs to Christ essentially as distinguished from the Father. To us they appear to agree most exactly with the interpretation of "Jehovah our righteousness," as a descriptive name of the Messiah given above. It may be added, that in the second passage, Jer. xxxiii. 16, some have supposed, not without considerable probability in their favour, that the epithet is given to Jerusalem, and that the learned Dr. Blayney (whom Dr. S. does not condescend to notice) translates the words, "Jehovah shall call his name 'our righteousness.'"

The argument in Section xxvi., on Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13, 14, is so fanciful, that even Dr. S. himself would hardly attribute to it much *independent* value, and we are sure that none of our readers will think it needs refutation. In the book of Revelation, the visionary scenes of which are every where expressed in language imitating, or borrowed from, the ancient prophets, the account of the vision of our glorified Lord contains some of the same words, and one descriptive circumstance, ("his head and his hair were white like wool," of radiant brightness,) the same as Daniel has used in representing "the Ancient of days," who is manifestly the Supreme Being himself. This is called so *definite* and *striking* a coincidence, "that the latter cannot but be regarded as designedly alluding to the former." Hence it is expected we should be ready to believe the identity of Christ with the Ancient of days. Now, when it is said (Dan. vii. 13) that "one like to a SON OF MAN approached to the ANCIENT of DAYS, and was *brought near* to his presence," Dr. S. thinks the word rendered *was brought near*, though "it does not necessarily imply more than a near approach, may be justly extended to the expression of a personal union. Its radical idea is that of *very close contact;* and its different forms are applied to many instances of *conjunction*, *indwelling*, and *union*, the most *near and intimate that can exist* amongst men. Upon these grounds it is submitted as a fair and rational interpretation of the whole passage, to view it as declaring, in the symbolical language of prophecy, an *assumption* of the frail and humble nature of a child of man into an absolute union with the great ETERNAL."

The meaning of the Hebrew word is "to be, or be brought *near*." It is used equally of friendly and hostile approach, of nearness in *place*, *time*, *relationship*, *dignity*, or *favour*. By a very natural application of the idea of *nearness*, it is used as a name for what is within us, in reference either to the body or the mind. We can see nothing mysterious or abstruse in its applications, and the idea of extorting from the words, "one like to a son of man was *brought near* TO THE PRESENCE of the Ancient of days," a

declaration of the "absolute union of a child of man with the GREAT ETERNAL," is perfectly monstrous. Yet our author is one who is ever ready to reproach Unitarians with *far-fetched* interpretations invented to *serve a purpose.*

The passage in Micah, which is treated of in the xxviith Section, contains the words, (according to Dr. S.'s translation,) "whose comings forth are from eternity, from the days of the everlasting period," which he calls "*a clear assertion* (respecting the Messiah) *of prior and eternal existence.*" The literal version is, "whose *descent** is from ancient times,† from the days of old."‡ The passage is interpreted by Grotius, Dathe, and others, as applying primarily to Zerubbabel, affirming the ancient glory of his family. If belonging strictly and solely to the Messiah, it affirms his designation to his mission in the counsels of God, or perhaps, as it is connected with the mention of Bethlehem, his derivation from the family of David. What then becomes of the *clear* assertion of our Saviour's prior and eternal existence?

Section xxx. Zech. xii. 8—10. "They shall look unto me (Jehovah, as appears from the connexion) whom they have pierced." The words are applied to our Lord, John xix. 37, where they are quoted, "They shall look upon *him* whom they have pierced." Dr. S. concludes that Christ is Jehovah. We hold it to be very evident that the Apostle John only accommodates to his purpose the words of Zechariah, as, according to the most judicious critics, he has done other passages of Scripture in the same narrative of our Lord's death. With Grotius we understand the prophet to use the word *pierced* figuratively for "treated with insult and injury;" but if it should be thought that the passage in Zechariah is prophetic of the circumstances attending the death of Christ, many MSS., by the addition of only a letter, read "look on him," instead of "on me," which reading is preferred by Kennicott, Newcome, &c. One distinguished critic (Dr. Blayney, see his translation of Zechariah) thinks the present Hebrew words may be translated "look on him," and others render them "look to me (i. e. for pardon) *with respect to him* whom they pierced." So that there can be no necessity for supposing the prophet to have spoken of Jehovah being literally pierced, a sentiment which would have excited the indignation and horror of all his countrymen.

Section xxxi. Zech. xiii. 7. "Sword! awake against my shepherd, against the man of my resemblance, saith Jehovah of hosts." So Dr. S.; our Common Version has "the man that is *my fellow;*" Archbishop Newcome, "the man that is *near unto me;*" Dr. Blayney, "that is next unto me," observing in a note that it means "next unto me in power and authority, and corresponds with my shepherd in the parallel line; one that rules his flock or people under me by virtue of my commission," and he quotes Calvin to the same purpose. The Hebrew word is explained in the lexicons a *friend, neighbour,* or *companion.* The radical meaning is *parti-*

---

* מוצאתיו ortus, origines ejus.

† קדם the root, signifies *to precede* or *go before;* as a noun, *what is before;* as 1, *the east,* whence the sun seems to come; 2, *former times, antiquity* to an indefinite extent, but without the idea of *eternity,* except incidentally from the nature of the subject with which it is connected.

‡ עולם *eternity,* indefinite duration, past or future, often signifying former times: thus ימות עולם "the days of old," Deut. xxxii. 7; עם עולם "the people of former times," Ezek. xxvi. 20; כמתי עולם "as the dead of former times," those who have been long dead, Psalm cxliii. 3, &c.

cipation, having something in common. Dr. S., as might be expected, contends for *equality of rank* and *identity of nature*. More modestly and justly Dr. Boothroyd:

"I adhere to the version, *my fellow*, because I think there is the same *ambiguity* in the term, as in the original: it may mean 'his intimate friend and associate;' one engaged in that work which his wisdom had planned from eternity; or it may signify the man who is at the same time a Divine person, '*my equal*,' as enjoying the same nature"—Boothroyd, as quoted by Smith, Script. Test. p 477, note, 2nd ed.

The words, in truth, may be accommodated to, but *can never prove*, the doctrine of Christ's deity, and it is proof which we require.

We have now examined *every text* adduced by Dr. S. from the Old Testament, which, as translated and interpreted by him, contains any thing inconsistent with the Unitarian doctrine, and we submit our remarks to the inquiring and candid reader with great confidence as to the result. There may be a few passages which, supposing the Deity of Christ, and his participation in the peculiar and sacred name *Jehovah*, to be independently and incontestably established, might admit of interpretation conformably with those doctrines, but there is not one which does not admit of *ready* and *natural* explanation on other principles, and the greater number may perhaps seem to be *incapable of bearing* the sense which has been assigned to them. We have a few observations yet to offer on the remaining portions of Dr. S.'s Second Book. But we think we have already established solid ground for the conclusion, not only as has been admitted by many learned defenders of the Trinity, that no proof of that doctrine can be found in the Old Testament, but that nothing at all plausible can be thence produced in favour of the reputedly orthodox views respecting our Lord's person, and therefore that an examination of the evidence of the *New Testament* is abundantly sufficient to determine the controversy, and Mr. Belsham was by no means called upon to say any thing more on the passages appealed to from the Old Testament, than he has had the opportunity of saying conformably with the plan he has adopted.

"In several parts of the Old-Testament Scriptures," says Dr. Smith, "a person is introduced under the name *angel of* Jehovah, in circumstances and with attributes and ascriptions so remarkable as to require a peculiar consideration."

We need not at present enumerate the passages selected. Our author states that three modes for their explanation are proposed:

"1st. That the angel of the Divine presence was some eminent, celestial creature; sent to convey the messages of the Divine will to those who were the immediate subjects of revelation; acting, therefore, on the behalf of the Deity, and allowed to *personate* the Deity in the assumption of the attributes and forms of address which are distinctive of him."

This, the hypothesis of Episcopius, Le Clerc, Dr. S. Clarke, and Henry Taylor, in *Ben Mordecai's Letters*, is examined and rejected by Dr. S., but it does not seem necessary for us, in reference to the object we have at present in view, to detain our readers by its discussion.

"2. That the expression is nothing but a Hebraism to denote God himself, or any peculiar token of the Divine presence, such as the burning bush was, or the pillar of cloud and fire, or the ark of the sanctuary. Thus Mr. Belsham says, 'The phrase *angel of Jehovah* means either the visible symbol of the Divine presence, or Jehovah himself.' (Calm Inquiry, p. 308.) But

this hypothesis utterly fails, by its leaving unaccounted for the very strong attributions of *intelligence, will, power, moral action,* and all personal properties; which it would be perfectly absurd to apply to a visible splendour, or any symbolical phenomenon whatever; and by its overlooking the *essential* part of the case, the clear and marked DISTINCTION which is preserved between this personal angel and him who sent him. It is this distinction so widely different from the idea of either a symbolical token or a personal periphrasis, which makes the insuperable difficulty upon the Unitarian hypothesis."

"3 That the being eminently called the angel of Jehovah, is one who is in certain respects or properties *distinct* from God; and yet is at the same time truly and essentially THE SAME with God."

To our minds this latter hypothesis is encumbered with difficulties incomparably greater than any which can be supposed to belong to either of the others. It is in fact perfectly unintelligible, predicating *distinctness* or difference, and *sameness* or identity, at one time, of the same subjects, which, if words have their ordinary meaning, is absurd and contradictory, and if otherwise, can convey no useful instruction; but we must inquire a little into the alleged *utter failure* of the Unitarian hypothesis. It fails, according to our author, 1st, by leaving unaccounted for the attributions of intelligence, &c., which it would be perfectly absurd to apply to a visible splendour or any symbolical phenomenon. But is it absurd to apply them to the being whose immediate interference the outward symbol was intended to manifest, and to whom alone the acts and words accompanying it were alleged to belong? The question we apprehend to be, whether it can be shewn by sufficient examples that the phrase *angel of Jehovah* is used to signify any agent, animate or inanimate, which is specially employed to accomplish the Divine Will, or any sensible manifestation of his presence visible, audible, or both, in human form or otherwise, which God was pleased to make in accomplishing his purposes. It is nothing to our present argument if the word angel is sometimes applied to human messengers, sometimes to a superior order of created intelligences. If we can shew that it is used in the manner stated above, Dr. Smith's objection is answered, and his own explanation of the passages he has cited is rendered needless and improbable. Now, in Isa. xxxvii. 36, we read, "The *angel of Jehovah* went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred and fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, they were all dead corpses," where, although there is some difference of opinion among the commentators whether God made use for the accomplishment of his purpose of a sudden plague, or of the Simoom, the pestilential wind of the desert, it is generally agreed that he employed some natural agent which is denominated the "angel of Jehovah," Ps. xxxv. 5. The angel of the Lord signifies any instrument of Divine vengeance. In Exod. iii. 2, the angel of Jehovah most plainly means the "*flame of fire* in the midst of the bush." It was a visible symbol of the Divine presence intended to fix the attention of Moses on the spot from which the voice was to proceed. Another indisputable instance of the symbol of the Divine presence being called the *angel of God*, is found Exod. xiv. 19, compared with xiii. 21, 22, "And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them, and (rather *even*) the pillar of cloud went from before their face and stood behind them." "And Jehovah went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light, to go by day and night." Compare also Exod. xxiii. 20—22, xl. 33—38. The former of these passages is quoted

by Dr. S., and the clause, "for my name is within him," seems to be properly understood by him as identifying the angel with Jehovah; but he does not seem to be aware that this angel means *the pillar of cloud and fire* from which Jehovah talked with Moses, and gave manifestations of his peculiar presence and agency, not in any respect a distinct being or person. In the cases of the angel of Jehovah appearing to Hagar, to Abraham, and to Manoah and his wife in human form, the angel is in each case identified in the narrative with Jehovah himself; we therefore conclude that the human form was only a manifestation of the peculiar presence of God, not a being commissioned by him. Our author indeed affirms that the Unitarian hypothesis "overlooks the *essential* part of the case, the clear and marked DISTINCTION which is preserved between this personal angel and him who sent him." The assertion is positive, but it is unsupported by evidence. We have shewn that the use of the word angel is not of itself sufficient to establish such distinction; and after the most careful examination of all the passages we can find nothing else which even appears to indicate it. Dr. S. has himself quoted the words of Rosenmüller: "Thus very frequently in these books the names *Jehovah*, and *angel of Jehovah*, are used interchangeably, the latter signifying that visible symbol under which God allowed himself to be seen by men."

Dr. S., rightly we think, considers the passage in Gen. xviii., where three human figures appeared to Abraham, as of the same kind with the others which he produces, although the expression *angel of Jehovah* is not there employed; but we are at a loss to conceive how he could regard it as favouring his own views. The sacred historian commences by saying that *Jehovah appeared* to Abraham; the man who remained conversing with him spoke to him as Jehovah himself, not any distinct or inferior being; and the same thing may be observed of the one who spoke to Lot. As there were several different purposes to be accomplished, different manifestations of Divine agency were employed, strikingly representing to ignorant men the idea of sovereign power acting in different places and upon different affairs at the same time; but the language of the historian, taken strictly, identifies all the appearances with Jehovah; and upon the whole, this seems to us to be the explanation of the passage attended with least difficulty. Dr. S. quotes some of the Jewish commentaries, in order, as we understand him, to shew that the person who remained with Abraham, usually considered as the chief of the three, had a peculiar relation to Jehovah, yet a distinct personality.

"Upon this passage the Jerusalem Targum says, '*the word* (mimra) *of Jehovah appeared to him* (i. e. Abraham) *in the valley of vision.*' Other Jewish writings have the following explications:—'*The Shekinah was associated with them, and detained Abraham till the angels departed. He said not who he was, but in all these (appearances) it was the angel of the covenant.*'"

To understand these comments we must bear in mind that *mimra*, *the word* of any person, in the dialect of the Targums is only a fuller expression for the person himself, and is so used continually both of God and men, so that the words of the Jerusalem Targum express precisely the same as the words of the book of Genesis itself: "Jehovah appeared to him." A single example of this idiom we shall give for the satisfaction of our readers: the words *a covenant betwixt me and thee* are rendered in the Targum "a covenant between *my word* and *thy word*." So "the word of Jehovah" is a familiar expression for Jehovah himself. In like manner the word

Shekinah is constantly used in the Jewish writings for God himself—the manifestation of his presence any where on earth ; and the meaning of the second passage quoted is, that one of the persons was a manifestation of God himself, the other two were angels. With respect to the expression *angel of the covenant*, which our author would no doubt have us refer to our Lord Jesus Christ, we have the express testimony of an ancient Jewish writer, that wherever it occurs " the holy and blessed God himself is spoken of." This testimony is taken from the same book as Dr. S.'s quotation ; (Sohar, Genes. fol. 68, col. 268;) but this is not all—will the reader believe it? the very passage which Dr. S. produces, and which it will be observed is broken off abruptly as he gives it, concludes, somewhat awkwardly for his argument, " and all these things are spoken of the holy and blessed God himself," clearly shewing that the Jewish writer understood *the angel of the covenant*, as a name of God himself in reference to his manifestation of himself in establishing a covenant with his people. Lest our readers should, too naturally, conclude that Dr. S. intentionally suppressed the important explanatory clause, which we have here given—a subterfuge of which we hope he is incapable, we will mention that in the authority to which he refers, (Schoettg. Horæ Hebr. et Talm. Vol. II. p. 442,) the words of the original being inserted between the parts of the translation, the final clause would be very easily overlooked by one hastily consulting the passage, which, we conclude, must have been our author's case. Dr. S. refers to passages in the prophecies of Zechariah, i. 8, 10—13, ii. 8—11, iii. 1—10, vi. 12, 13, 15,) in which, according to him, we find the great angel who is at once the messenger of Jehovah and Jehovah himself, " depicted in the appropriate and exclusive characteristics of the Messiah, the Saviour, the Priest upon his throne, the Intercessor: and not less certainly described as possessing the attributes, exercising the sovereignty, and wearing the holy and incommunicable name of JEHOVAH." Unfortunately he has not stated how he derived all this from the words of the prophet, and as we can form no conception of the process we know not what remarks to offer, but Dr. S. requests " the serious inquirer to examine the whole"—and if he will do this, he will, we think, participate in our curiosity to know what the particular clauses are upon which the imagination of our author has been at work, and how his ingenuity could find in them any semblance of a foundation for his assertions.

In the passage quoted from Mal. iii. 1, we think it very clear that the last clause, " Behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts," does not prove the person coming to be really or personally distinct from Jehovah himself. The prophecy is, that God will manifest himself amongst his people. They had vainly said, " Where is the God of judgment?" (Mal. ii. 17) In due time they should be brought to acknowledge his presence, and special interference in their affairs. This manifestation may be rightly explained of the coming and kingdom of the Messiah, who exhibited the most convincing proofs of Divine power accompanying his works, and Divine authority sanctioning his words, but it by no means follows that he must be personally spoken of: on the contrary, that " *the Sovereign* האדון whom ye seek," means God himself, seems to be justly inferred from the uniform use of אדון with the emphatic ה, and we have already given Jewish authority for understanding the " *angel of the covenant*" in the same sense, as the parallelism seems to require. We would compare with this expression Isa. lxiii. 9, " the *angel of his presence* saved them," where the *angel of*

his presence is God himself, manifesting himself by some sensible sign, and cannot possibly be understood of any distinct being; and Gen. xlviii. 15, 16, "God before whom my fathers did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, *the angel which redeemed me from all evil*, bless the lads"—where no one can doubt that *the angel* means God himself, in reference to his sensible manifestations of himself to Jacob. Upon the whole, we do not hesitate to pronounce our author's attempt to identify our Lord Jesus Christ with the angel of Jehovah, and thence with Jehovah himself, to be a total failure, and incapable of affording satisfaction to any inquiring mind; whilst the general view of the nature of the passages referred to on the subject, which Mr. Belsham has given, is at once rational and consistent in itself, and abundantly established by their examination in detail.

The section on the pluralisms is highly creditable to Dr. S. for the candour and caution as well as the learning and ingenuity which it displays, and we think he has made the most that is possible of a very dubious and obscure argument. We must observe, however, that as he only contends for an *intimation* of plurality of persons, which may not, he acknowledges, have been understood by *the majority of the Jewish people*, which even *inspired prophets may not have fully comprehended*, and which he cannot prove to have been so understood by any of the ancient Jews, his argument at best is only applicable in confirmation of other evidence: but we deny that he has produced, or that any one can produce, any such evidence from the Old Testament, and we feel fully authorized in contenting ourselves with the information which is *directly* afforded us, without disturbing ourselves about fancied *intimations*, that is, obscure and uncertain hints, which we find opposed to the *plain* and (setting aside these supposed hints) *uniform* language of the Jewish sacred writings. And, moreover, though we think Dr. S. has shewn that the rule of Hebrew syntax respecting the use of the plural number to express dominion, dignity, or honour, is not very definitely established, or of very general application, we can by no means allow that he has sufficiently explained on other principles all the alleged instances, or even satisfactorily shewn, supposing that the idiom were observable only in the names of the true God, how it can support the Trinitarian doctrine, since if plurality is at all implied, it must be plurality of beings—plurality of Gods. The notion of different persons in one essence is one which would never occur to any mind without being very distinctly expressed, and of which no conception whatever could be obtained in the way of *intimation*.

The explanation proposed by our author of the frequent use of the word אדנים, (adonim,) *lords*, (the plural for the singular,) as applied to human beings is, that the word was originally a name of God, and being *secondarily* applied to human possessors of authority, retained the form which belonged to its *primary* use: but no reason or authority whatever can be adduced to shew that the word was at first a peculiar name of the Supreme Being: its meaning would render it equally applicable to God and man, and it is applied to both in the singular form also; we are therefore justified in concluding, that whatever may have been the origin of the anomaly of the use of the plural form in a singular sense, it was something not peculiar to one application of the word, but common to all the cases in which the anomaly is observed.

The use of *Baalim*, (owners, masters, husbands,) in the plural, with a singular sense, is so exactly analogous to that of *Adonim*, that no one could have thought of finding a different explanation for it, except under the influence of a favourite hypothesis. That which our author has devised, how-

ever ingenious, will hardly be thought, by any competent judge, sufficiently probable to answer his purpose.*

Dr. S.'s observations do not materially affect the probability that *Tannim*, the crocodile, Ezek. xxix. 3, is a plural form with a singular sense, and though he readily adopts the opinion of some modern Hebrew scholars that חכמות, (Chochmoth,) *wisdom* is singular, it seems to us that this opinion rests on very slight foundation, and that the generally-received doctrine of its being a plural form is by far the most probably correct. *Behemoth* we will lay no stress upon, though the Coptic derivation is not certainly established, but other instances of the use of a plural for a singular noun to give emphasis, or to produce the effect of a sort of superlative degree, all seem to belong to the same idiom. Thus *blindnesses* for total blindness, Gen. xix. 11; 2 Kings vi. 18. *Salvations* for complete salvation, Ps. xlii. 5, 11, liii. 6. *Vanities* for much vanity, Eccles. v. 7, &c. There seems, then, good reason for believing that the use of a plural for a singular was one of the various modes of giving emphasis, or marking eminence resorted to by the Hebrews; and that though not applied generally to all words expressive of authority or dignified office, but confined by early custom to a small number, selected in a way which appears to us arbitrary, it does occur in cases where the sense is indisputably singular, and might be used by the people to whom the idiom belonged without suggesting any idea of plurality.

In several of the instances of the application of plural names to the Supreme Being, the intention of augmenting the force of the epithet is sufficiently evident, as Prov. ix. 10, "The beginning of wisdom is the fear of Jehovah, and the knowledge of the *holy ones*, i. e. *most holy*, (as it has been properly rendered by Dathe,) is understanding." So in Hos. xii. 1. Of the same nature seems to be the Chaldee plural עליונין (Elionin), Dan. vii. 18. The word in the singular means *very high*, or might even be rendered *most high;* but the plural form increases the force of the epithet.

It has often been remarked that Jehovah, the peculiar and sacred name of the true God, is singular, whilst the plural name, Elohim, אלהים is one which is equally applied to idols, and is even given, without impropriety, to human objects of respect, and which, so far as we know or have any means of judging, may be supposed to be a word of human construction, signifying an object of adoration. Dr. S. indeed maintains, that when the word Elohim is applied to a single idol, it refers to something plural in its nature, and he reminds us of the multiform appearance of many idols; but this is a mere hypothesis, and it is more natural and reasonable to suppose that the plurality in the name had the same cause in all the cases of its occurrence. Dr. S. thinks that when it is said to Moses (Ex. iv. 16), "Thou shalt be to him (לאלהים) *for*, *as* or *instead of Elohim*," "The sense is palpably limited to his acting, on the occasion, as the immediate messenger and representative of the Most High," and in like manner Ex. vii. 1. It

* The word does not occur in the full plural form, but in construction with a pronominal suffix, בעליו Dr. S. denies that this is plural at all, and supposes the י to be introduced in imitation of other names of relationship, אב a father, אביך thy father, אח a brother, אחיו his brother, חם a father-in-law, חמיה her father-in-law. But in all these instances the primitive forms, as our author properly states, appear to have been חמי אחי אבי which readily accounts for the insertion of the י before the suffix, and there is no reason why they should have been imitated in words of a different form; at the best the supposition is a mere conjecture, resorted to *to suit a purpose*, and not being a very plausible one, the more obvious explanation founded on the analogy of אדני will continue to be generally received.

certainly seems to us, on the contrary, that the only admissible sense is, "thou shalt be to him as a superior being delivering directions, which it shall be his business to obey;" that it is not being the organ of Jehovah, but exercising that kind of superiority and authority which the name *Elohim* implies, which is intended, and, therefore, that the word could not have been used had it been of the nature of a proper name, or had its plural form been considered as connected with any mystery. Again, in the passage adduced by Mr. Belsham from 1 Sam. xxviii. 13, "I see *Elohim olim* literally, *Gods ascending*, but supposed by Mr. B. to mean only the figure of Samuel," Dr. S. affirms, that

"Whatever the impostress saw or pretended to see, her words undeniably affirm a plurality of objects. The figure of Samuel could, therefore, have been only one form out of several; so that to regard Elohim as an appellation given to Samuel, is both begging the question, and a violation of the plain grammar of the passage."

Now this is pretty strong assertion, but it cannot alter the facts of the case. When the woman said to Saul, "I saw Gods ascending out of the earth, he said unto her, What form is HE of?" (Plainly shewing that Saul understood her to speak of *one* figure.) "She said, An old man cometh up and is covered with a mantle, and Saul perceived that it was Samuel." The connexion seems to us to prove, beyond all question, that only one figure is at all said to have appeared, and that this being considered as something supernatural, was called a God (Elohim) by the ignorant or artful woman. As to the grammar, the construction is precisely the same with *Elohim Shofetim*, (both plural,) "a God that judgeth," Ps. lviii. 12. *Elohim haiim*, (both plural,) the living God, &c. Mr. B.'s example, then, is a very clear and important one of this plural in a singular sense being used of one being recognized as distinct from and inferior to God, and consequently implying no mystery of the Divine nature. But, according to our author, *Elohim* not being limited like *Jehovah* to express the Supreme Being alone,

"For that very reason it became the more necessary to guard against possible and probable abuse. As the word was in ordinary use to designate the numerous false deities of the nations, it was the more likely, and even unavoidable that the Hebrews would understand its perpetual occurrence in the plural form as the designation of their own God to be an express intimation that plurality in some sense belonged to HIM."—(Script. Test. p. 517.)

We cannot, we confess, understand the logic of this passage. Because the word Elohim, a plural form, was in ordinary use to designate *any one* of the false deities of the nations, each one of which was known to be, and always considered to be *singular*, therefore the Hebrews would understand it to have a *plural* sense when applied to a Being, "of whose *essential unity*, (to use Dr. S.'s words,) from other infallible testimonies, they were certain." We surely only do justice to them in supposing that had any doubt been suggested they would have drawn the contrary conclusion, and *knowing* the *unity* of the object denoted by the plural term in the case of the idol, would have concluded the unity also, independently of any declaration of it, of that Being, concerning whose nature they could not have direct knowledge. We have enlarged upon this subject, not because we think the argument from the pluralisms likely to have much weight with any inquirer, rejected as it has been by many of the most learned defenders of the Trinity, and obscure and dubious as it appears, even admitting all that is affirmed—but because, being a curious subject and very ably treated by Dr. S., we imagined many

readers might be glad to see it noticed somewhat more fully than Unitarian controversialists in general deem necessary.

Dr. S. devotes a chapter to "An Inquiry into the State of Opinion and Expectation with respect to the Messiah existing among the Jews in the period between the closing of the Old Testament and the dissolution of their National Establishment."

It is a subject to which many of the defenders of reputed orthodoxy attach much importance, and what our author has written upon it claims our notice as much on account of *concessions*, which, coming from one of his opinions, as well as his learning, deserve to be recorded, as on account of arguments which we are unwilling to pass by without an attempt to ascertain their real value.

The chapter contains five sections devoted to the inquiry, and a sixth stating the results. The subjects are, 1. The Syriac and Septuagint Versions; 2. The Chaldee Targums; 3. The Apocrypha; 4. The Works of Philo and Josephus; 5. The Rabbinical Writings.

"The Syriac Version of the Old Testament is considered by the critics as of an antiquity prior to the Christian era . . . . It is a strict version; and it is remarkably clear and strong in those passages which attribute characters of Deity to the Messiah."

In what degree Dr. S. has exaggerated the testimony of this version in his favour, we shall not now stop to inquire. We think we might trust our own cause to a fair examination of that version only; but we would ask what he means by asserting that it is "considered by critics as of an antiquity prior to the Christian era"? No doubt it is so considered by some writers; indeed, it has been affirmed to be as old as the time of Solomon; but a much later date has been assigned to it by critics of deservedly high authority in such matters, and we have been accustomed to consider its having been made some time after the Christian era so much as a settled point, that we were surprised at a contrary statement, unaccompanied by a hint of uncertainty or a particle of evidence. The most probable date of the Syriac Version of the Old Testament seems to be about the latter end of the second century after Christ. As to the Greek Version, Dr. S. avows that it gives him no assistance, and in consequence he treats, perhaps, with less than justice its venerable authors.

In the section on the Targums, or ancient Chaldee Paraphrases on the Old Testament, he insists, indeed, that the instances he has brought forward in speaking of the original texts, "*though the number of such is not great*, have sufficiently shewn that the writers did not refrain from ascribing to the Messiah the titles and attributes of the Supreme God;" but he, with evident reluctance, and much to the credit both of his judgment and his honesty, abandons the argument from the use of the phrase, *the word of the Lord*, giving the following, after a full illustration of the subject by examples, as "the results of impartially examining the question:"

"1. That the primary import of the Chaldee expression is *that*, whatever it may be, which is the MEDIUM of communicating the mind and intention of one person to another.

"2. That it thence assumed the sense of a reciprocal pronoun. 3. That when used in the latter sense, its most usual application is to the Divine Being; denoting, if we may use the expression, GOD, *his very self*; *Deus ipsissimus*; and is the synonyme and substitute of the most exclusive of all the appellatives of Deity, the name JEHOVAH. 4. That there is no certain proof of its being distinctly applied to the Messiah in any of the Targums

now extant; while, in very numerous places, it is so plainly used, with *personal* attributives, yet in distinction from the name of God, that an application to the Messiah cannot be held improbable." [This extorted acknowledgment is enough for our purpose, but we are prepared to contest the statement in the latter clause.] " 5. That solely from the use of the phrase, *the memra of Jah*, or *the word of the Lord*, in those paraphrases, no absolute information can be deduced, concerning the doctrine of the Jews, in the interval between the Old Testament and the New, upon the person of their expected Messiah. I have said *solely* from the use of this phrase; but if we combine this fact with others, derived from the study of the Old Testament, it will, I conceive, appear a very rational conjecture, that the Rabbinical authors of the age referred to, had vague ideas of the *Word* as an intelligent agent, the medium of the Divine operations and communications to mankind. I cannot, however, make this opinion a ground of independent argument, as has been done by some writers,* who have probably taken it from each other in succession, without much severity of examination."—Scripture Test. Ch. vii. Vol. I. pp. 561—563, 2d edition.

Although his conjecture as to the Rabbinical use of the term *Word* does not seem to us very *rational*, we can excuse Dr. S.'s anxiety to find in the phraseology of the Targums what his fancy may represent as relics of a faith, in his estimation purer, existing in earlier times, in consideration of the candour of his acknowledgment that the use of the phrase "Word of the Lord," *can afford no absolute information concerning the doctrine of the Jews of that age upon the person of the expected Messiah.* As to the alleged instances of titles and attributes of the Supreme God being ascribed in the Targums to the Messiah, we can only say that we are acquainted with *no such instances*, and that in the examples produced by Dr. S. he appears to us to have strangely misconceived the meaning of the author's words; of this we shall give one or two specimens in justification of what we have asserted. In Dr. S.'s supplementary note on 2 Sam. xxiii. 1—7, is the following passage:

"A part of this Targum or Chaldee Paraphrase of Jonathan deserves to be transcribed, as an interesting proof that the ancient Jews regarded the passage as certainly referring to the Messiah; and that in so applying it, they attributed to him the express characters of Deity. *The God of Israel spake with respect to me, the Rock of Israel, the Sovereign of the sons of men, the true Judge hath spoken to appoint me king, for* HE *is the Messiah that shall be, who shall arise and rule in the fear of the Lord.*"

Now we venture to present what follows as a faithful translation of the words of the Targum as found in the London Polyglott, which we transcribe in the note:

"David said, The God of Israel hath spoken to me; the Rock of Israel, He who ruleth among the sons of men; the righteous Judge hath said, that he would appoint to me a king (i. e. as a successor). This is the Messiah who will arise and rule in the fear of the Lord."†

Whatever may be the sense of the original, it is perfectly evident that this Paraphrast considered the words of God to David to be the promise of a

---

* "Particularly by *Dr. Peter Allix*, in his *Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church;* a work not remarkable for accurate statement or judicious reasoning."—Author's note.

† אמר דוד אלהא דישראל עלי מלל תקיפא דישראל דשליט בבני אנשא
קושטא דאן אמר למנאה לי מלכא דהוא משיחא דעתיד דיקום וישלוט ברחלתא
Targum on 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, 4.—: דיי

king to sit on his throne, and explained that promise as applying to the Messiah, who was to rule *in the fear of Jehovah*, not to *be* the God of Israel. Dr. S.'s translation is unwarrantable, as the meaning he assigns to the passage is preposterous.

One other example, which we shall take from the xlvth Psalm, will suffice. Dr. S. quotes from the Targum,

"Ver. 2. Thy beauty, O king Messiah, is pre-eminent above the sons of men: the spirit of prophecy is given unto thy lips: therefore God hath blessed thee for ever. (Ver. 7.) The throne of thy glory, O Jehovah, standeth for ever and ever; a righteous sceptre is the sceptre of thy kingdom. (Ver. 8.) Because thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness, therefore thus hath Jehovah thy God anointed thee with the ointment of joy profusely above thy fellows."

There is surely enough in this passage which is inconsistent with Deity in the person addressed, but the question is whether Dr. S. has rightly translated and applied the words of the Targum, ver. 7; and if we were obliged to admit without question the present pointing of the word קִים, we could not object to his version, however much we might be astonished at the sense it seems to convey; but the Targums originally existed and long remained unpointed. The pointing was first performed by various and unknown individuals in a very inaccurate manner, and as now given, it has been reviewed and corrected by several Christians, especially by Buxtorf, who would, without doubt, point according to their own notion of the sense of the passage. Now, considering the word קִים as a verb, and pointing it with a Trere instead of a Kametz under the י, the translation is, "*The throne of thy glory Jehovah hath established for ever*," which exactly corresponds with the sense ascribed to the Hebrew original by Mr. Belsham and others. And if any one is scrupulous about altering the points, (though their authority is generally allowed to be exceedingly small,) we would refer him to the Targum on Ps. x. ver. 12, where the same word occurring *as a verb* is, nevertheless, pointed with the Kametz, probably by mistake, as there seems to be no doubt about the sense. The words are קוֹם " קִים שבוּעת יִדך, "Arise, O Jehovah, *establish* the covenant of thy hand." All other supposed cases of divine names being attributed to the Messiah in the Targums are susceptible of equally easy explanation.

In his chapter on the Apocrypha, Dr. S.'s utmost ingenuity can produce nothing more like evidence for his system than the expression "Eternal Saviour" in the book of Baruch, a book the date of which is unknown, and which is entirely destitute of authority. Yet even here the Common Version, "The *Everlasting*, our Saviour," is to be preferred to his, because *the Everlasting* occurs frequently as a name of the Deity in the same book, and is even found in the same sentence.

From Philo our author quotes pretty largely. He identifies the *logos* of this writer with the *Messiah*, supposing him to have been led by his philosophical opinions to dwell chiefly on the *spiritual* part of the mixed nature, whilst he occasionally recognizes *personal* qualities rather through the influence of the prevailing opinions of the Jews in general, than in strict consistency with his own theories.

"It appears to me," says Dr. S, "that there is a *real inconsistency* in the assertions and doctrines of Philo concerning the Logos; but such inconsistency as, though not excusable, is yet capable of being accounted for on the common principles of human infirmity." . . . "From all the circumstances, it seems to me the most reasonable conclusion, that the leading

acceptation of the *memra* or *logos*, among the Jews of this middle age, was to designate an *intelligent, intermediate agent;* that in the sense of a Mediator between God and man, it became a recognized appellative of the Messiah; that the *personal* doctrine of the WORD was the one generally received; and that the *conceptual* notion, which Philo interweaves with the other, was purely his own invention, the result of his theological philosophy, and the filling up, as it were, and finishing of a favourite theory."—Script. Test. Vol. I. pp. 599, 600, 2nd ed.

No one will be surprised that a sufficient number of passages may be found in the writings of Philo, in which the *logos* is so spoken of; that taken from their connexion, considered apart from the other doctrines of their author, and with the assumption of inconsistency and error on his part, whenever it may seem to be required, they may appear favourable to the doctrine which Dr. S. labours to defend; but a more particular examination of the opinions and language of the Jewish philosopher will, we think, prove that he has been greatly misunderstood by those who quote him as favouring the pre-existence or Deity of the Messiah, and that his writings can throw little light on Christian controversy, except as an example of that false philosophy which so early corrupted the church.

After rejecting the notion entertained by some, that Philo was a Christian, Dr. S. says,

"The coincidences of sentiment, and more frequently of phraseology, which occur in the writings of Philo with the language of Paul and of John in the New Testament, must be accounted for on some other principles. Yet it would be contrary to all the philosophy of human nature, not to ascribe these different but similar streams to one primary source. That source, I venture to propose, is not so much to be sought in the writings of Plato, or in the ethical lectures of the learned Jews of Alexandria, or in the sole speculations and invented diction of Philo himself;—as in the SACRED WRITINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, transfused into the Alexandrian idiom, paraphrased and amplified in the terms and phrases which were vernacular to the Grecian Jews, and mixed in a very arbitrary manner with the speculations both of the Persian and the Greek philosophers."—Script. Test. Vol. I. p. 574, 2nd ed.

Dr. S. can hardly mean to deny that many of the most remarkable characteristics of the religious philosophy of Philo are derived from the school of Plato, and if due weight be given to his first remark in this passage, that the coincidences between the Jewish writer and the New Testament are *more frequently* of *phraseology than of sentiment*, and to the concluding one, that whatever was drawn from the Old Testament was *mixed in a very arbitrary manner with the speculations both of the Persian and Greek philosophers*, we see nothing in the rest to which we are disposed materially to object, or the full admission of which has any bearing on the points of difference between us and Dr. S.

There has been much discussion on the question, to what school of philosophy Philo ought to be considered as belonging; the general voice of antiquity declaring him a Platonist, whilst some learned moderns have maintained that he was an Eclectic; others have supposed him to represent the prevailing opinions of the Alexandrian Jews of his time; others, again, regard him as himself the founder of a sect, and the original author of the doctrines he delivered. It has been very justly remarked, that there is much less real difference between these several statements than would at first view appear, and than their authors supposed. If in insisting on the Platonism of Philo we must be understood to maintain that he professedly and exclusively addicted

himself to the Platonic school, against such an opinion arguments scarcely to be resisted might, without much difficulty, be adduced. Indeed, how could a Jew attached to his religion, disposed probably to regard as indirectly derived from the writings of his own lawgiver all that seemed excellent in the philosophy of other nations, and obliged to modify into at least apparent harmony with those writings all the doctrines which he embraced, profess unresisting submission to the dicta of any Pagan master? It is not to be denied, however, that some of the most striking peculiarities of the Platonic doctrine are adopted by Philo, and that he explains his meaning by phraseology and imagery derived from the works of Plato himself, and much used among his followers. If we call him an Eclectic, as there is no doubt that he occasionally quotes with approbation, and adopts without reserve, the sentiments of philosophers of different schools, still it is not the less manifest that his notions respecting the Divine Nature are Platonic. The later Platonists and Eclectics hardly differed except in name, the latter greatly admiring Plato and following him, especially on subjects relating to the nature of God and the mind.

Those who maintain that Philo only adopted the prevailing sentiments of the learned Jews at Alexandria, should recollect that these Jews studied in the schools of philosophy for which that city was celebrated, and in which a system, which, if not strictly Platonic, was very nearly allied to Platonism, was generally taught. It is probable enough that Philo may not have materially differed in opinion from the more learned of his countrymen in his native city, but it does not follow that his doctrines are Jewish traditions; it is rather evident how much the circumstances of their education led them to accommodate their religion to the wisdom of the age, explaining its simple truths according to the fanciful speculations of philosophy, and saving its historic details from the contempt with which they would otherwise have been inclined to treat them, by allegorizing them into the mystical expression of obscure and useless dogmas. Those who speak of Philo's philosophy as his own invention, and represent him rather as the founder of a sect than as a supporter of the doctrines of any former leader, can surely mean no more than that he made his *selection* of opinions for himself, that he adopted the *principle* of the Eclectics, but not satisfied with what was done in their schools, being, indeed, in a peculiar situation as a Jew, his doctrines did not sufficiently agree with theirs for him to be correctly described as belonging to their sect; all which is not, or need not be denied by those who call attention to the manifest signs of Platonism in the works of Philo, and clearly shew that much of his language, respecting the nature of the Deity, is derived, not from the principles of his own religion, or the traditions of his nation, but from the doctrines of the Greek philosopher, which, however, he has mixed with opinions derived from various other sources, and reduced into some sort of agreement with the principles of his own religion.

We cannot hope to understand the language of Philo respecting the *logos*, except by considering it in connexion with his whole doctrine concerning the Divine Nature. We ought, perhaps, hardly to expect perfect consistency from so obscure and mystical a writer, but it will help much to remove difficulties, if we keep in mind that many parts of his works are written *popularly*, according to that view of religion which he considered to be suited to the condition of mankind in general, whilst others are designed to express the more just and sublime sentiments to which only the learned and contemplative could attain, and which differ from the former so widely, that we might despair of harmonizing them, did we not meet with passages

in which the precepts and opinions of the popular religion are adapted to and explained by the sublimer theology.

That Philo, believing in one God, nevertheless frequently speaks of three divine principles, is a fact which has attracted much attention, and the proper explanation of which has been a subject of much discussion. By many he is considered as a believer in the Trinity, very nearly as it is received by most Christians. Others, sensible of the deviation of his doctrine from reputed orthodoxy, have, according to their own views, either condemned him as corrupting the traditions of his people with Platonism, or considered him as affording evidence favourable to the Arian doctrine; whilst a third party, much more justly, as it seems to us, have contended, that the three principles of Philo are not beings or persons, though sometimes figuratively spoken of with personal characters, but only *attributes*, and that he has derived them entirely from his philosophy, not at all from the traditionary religion of his nation.

Our first remark is, that this writer is not always content with making *three* principles in the Divine Nature, but sometimes appears to represent God himself as a distinct intelligence presiding over the three principles, and sometimes also increases the number of these principles. There is a very remarkable passage in the book περι φυγαδων (concerning fugitives) in which the author, allegorizing the precepts of the Mosaic law respecting the cities of refuge, absolutely speaks of *six* different principles in the Divine Nature all inferior to God himself, being really intended as no more than attributes, and yet having, apparently, distinct intelligence ascribed to them. The passage is long, but we think important: it is as follows:

"I must next explain which they are, and why their number is six Is not, then, the most ancient, the strongest and best, not city only, but *Metropolis*, the *Divine Word* to which, above all, it is most profitable to flee? But the other five *colonies*, as it were, are powers of him who uttered the *word*, of which the chief is the *creative*, by means of which the MAKER, *by his word*, fabricated the world. The second is the *royal*, by means of which, having created, he rules what he has made: the third is the *benignant*, through which the Maker pities, and is merciful to, his own work: the fourth is the *legislative* quality, through which he forbids those things which ought not to be. Fair and well fortified cities all of them, excellent places of refuge for those who are worthy of being saved. Good and humane is the appointment, fitted to excite and encourage hope. Who else could have exhibited such an abundance of beneficial things, according to the variety of cases of persons sinning unintentionally, who have not all the same strength or the same weakness? The intention is, that he who is capable of running swiftly should press on, without stopping to take breath, to that supreme divine *word* which is the fountain of wisdom; that, drinking from its stream, instead of death he may find as a reward eternal life; that he who is not equally swift should flee to the *creative* power, which Moses names God, because all things were disposed and arranged by it . . . . but that he who is not sufficiently active for this should take refuge with the *royal* power. . . . . But to him who is not sufficiently quick to reach the above-mentioned stations, as being far removed, other nearer goals are fixed of useful powers, the *merciful*, and that which *prescribes what should be done;* and that which *forbids what ought* not to be done . . . . . These are the six cities which are called *places of refuge*, of which five are figuratively represented, and have their resemblance in the sacred things. The commanding and forbidding powers (have as their types) the copy of the laws laid up in the ark of the covenant; but the merciful power, the cover of the ark itself, which is called the *mercy-seat;* and the

creative and *royal* powers, the two winged cherubim placed over it. But the divine *word*, superior to all these, *has not taken any visible form, as bearing a resemblance to no object of sense*, being the very image of God, the most ancient of all objects of thought, placed nearest, there being no separating interval, to him who alone truly exists; (possesses an independent existence;) for it is said (he here quotes Exod. xxv. 22), 'I will *speak* to thee from above the mercy-seat between the two cherubim,' so that the *Word* should be, as it were, a charioteer *to the other powers*, but he that uttereth the word, as the person riding in the chariot, who gives his command to the charioteer in all things for the right direction of the whole. He, then, who is not only free from voluntary guilt, but has not even involuntarily committed crime, *having God himself as his inheritance, will dwell in him alone;* but they who not intentionally but undesignedly have sinned, will have, as places of refuge, the cities which have been spoken of, abounding in good things and wealthy. Of these cities of refuge three are beyond the river, far removed from our race. Which are these? The *Word* of our Ruler and his *creative* and *royal* powers. For to them belong the heaven and the whole world. But neighbouring and contiguous to us, placed near to the mortal race of men, which alone is liable to sin, are the three on this side of the river, the *merciful* power, *that which commands what should be done*, and *that which forbids things not to be done*. For these are close at hand to us."—Philo de Profugis (pp. 464, 465, ed. Turnebi et Hoeschelii, Paris, 1640).

It is plain from this passage that Philo recognizes one Supreme and only true God, whom he placed above all those divine energies or attributes which he endowed with a sort of personality, much in the same manner as Proclus (Comm. in Timæum, Plat. Lib. ii.) contends that Plato himself considered the Supreme God as presiding over his three principles. Again, we see here that Philo is led by no better reason than the desire of allegorizing the six cities of refuge, to distinguish six divine principles instead of three, which he divides into two triads, one superior to the other, but both inferior to the Supreme God himself, whose qualities they all are. As to the nature of the *word*, we perceive that Philo had no conception whatever of its possible incarnation or sensible appearance among men; that he considered it as really nothing more than the utterance or expression of the will of the great Supreme; and that in figuratively giving it a personal character, he made it, though in some respects superior to the Divine attributes, yet inferior and subject to God himself. The following passage affords very distinct proof of the sense in which alone Philo attributed personal characters to the Divine perfections. It is an allegorization of the beginning of Gen. xviii.:

"For Abraham also coming with zeal, and haste, and great alacrity, orders Sarah, who represents virtue, to hasten and mix three measures of fine meal, and make hearth-cakes, when God, accompanied by his two principal powers, his *royalty* and his *goodness*, *He*, in the midst of them, being *one, produced three images in the visual soul*," (i. e. caused the visible appearance of three persons, though the whole was but a manifestation of himself alone,) "each of which could by no means be measured, for God is incomprehensible, and his powers are incomprehensible; but he measures all things, for his *goodness* is the measure of good men, his power is the measure of obedient men, but he himself, the Sovereign, is the measure of all corporeal and incorporeal things. Wherefore, these powers, obtaining the nature of rules and precepts, are a means of estimating things inferior to them. These three measures, then, it is good to have mingled and worked together in the soul, that being persuaded that God is supremely exalted, *who rises above his own powers*, and *is either perceived without them*, or *manifested in them*, it may receive the impressions of his power and beneficence, and, being initiated into the most

perfect mysteries, may not readily utter those divine secrets, but using them cautiously, and preserving silence upon them, may keep them sacred."—(Philo Jud. de Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini, p. 139, ed. Turn. et Hoesch.)

It seems justly to be inferred from this strange passage, in which Sarah is made to represent the state of the wise man, virtue, and her action of mixing the meal into cakes what is done by the philosophic mind, that Philo considered the different personations of the Deity, as distinct in the eyes of the ignorant and vulgar, but as perceived by true wisdom, to be none of them any other than God himself, and to have no real separate existence. We suppose he here understands the appearance to Abraham, as we have in a preceding part of this article explained it, not of any three beings, human or angelic, but of a triple *manifestation* of the one only God, which he therefore fancifully represents as himself, and two of his attributes or powers; but his whole object is to establish that these powers, though seeming distinct from him, and apparently endowed with a separate personality, are perceived by the reflecting and contemplative mind to be really but one and the same being, and to be only the exhibitions or effects of his attributes. In farther illustration of this subject, we must lay before our readers another extract relating to the same portion of sacred history, though taken from a different work of Philo, which seems fitted to remove every doubt respecting his notion of persons or distinctions in the Divine Nature:

"When, therefore, the mind is enlightened by God as if it were noon-day," (shining upon it, as it were, with a noon-day brightness,) "and, being altogether filled with a light of intelligence, is freed from shadows by the splendour diffused through it, it comprehends the three images of the one subject, *one* being *the reality*, (the real existence,) the other two, *shadows which it throws*, something like which happens also to objects in the light which is perceived by the senses, for things standing or moving in it often give two shadows. Let not, indeed, any one think that in speaking of God, the word shadows is employed literally; it is but a figurative use of the word for the clearer expression of the thing to be explained, since the truth is not thus. But any one approaching the nearest possible to the truth might say, that the middle one was the FATHER OF ALL, who in the sacred Scriptures is called by the peculiar name, HE WHO IS; (the *self-existent*, an interpretation of Jehovah;) but the powers on each side are the most ancient, and the most closely united to 'Him who is,' of which one is called the *creative*, the other the *royal*. And the *creative* power is GOD, for it established and arranged the whole; (deriving Θεος from Θεω, to *place* or *dispose*;) but the *royal* power is the LORD, for it is right that the Creator should rule over and govern that which is created. (This remark shews the essential identity, according to Philo, of the *creative* and *governing* powers.) He then that is in the middle, attended on each side by his powers, (or *attributes,)* affords to the acute understanding an image sometimes of *one*, sometimes of *three*. *Of one, when the soul, being completely purified, having risen above not only the multitude of inferior,* (powers,) *but also that pair which is near to the one,* (the Monad,) *hastens to attain to the pure, simple, and in itself complete, idea.* Of three, when not yet initiated in high mysteries, it is still occupied with inferior matters, *and is not able to comprehend him who exists without any other, by himself alone,* otherwise than by means of his acts, *creation* and *government*."—(Philo de Abrahamo, pp. 366, 367, ed. Turnebi et Hoesch.)

It is very observable that the Divine *word* or *logos* is not at all mentioned in either of the two passages last quoted, although it is not easy to conceive how it could have been omitted, had Philo considered it as having a real and distinct existence as a part of the Divine Nature. We have now seen

him at one time representing two triads of different degrees of inferiority to the Supreme God, at the head of the first of which the *logos* was placed, at another, constituting a triad of God himself and two of his perfections, without at all introducing the *logos;* and what we have seen of his meaning in attributing personal characters to divine perfections, will prepare us for understanding the language which has been so confidently appealed to by the Christian defenders of mystical notions respecting the nature of him who is called the "Word of God." We shall first state what appears to be the true meaning of Philo in using the term *logos*, and shall then take such farther notice as may seem requisite of the supposition of his having employed the term in two different senses, the one derived from the Platonic philosophy, the other from the religious traditions of his countrymen, and of the epithets he has given to his *logos*, which are supposed to prove its identity with the Messiah predicted in the Jewish Scriptures. *First*, then, we believe that the *logos* of Philo really signifies the Divine *intelligence* or *wisdom*, a property or attribute of the Divine Nature, not a real person, or distinct subsistence, and has personal qualities ascribed to it only in the same sense in which other Divine perfections or energies, as the *creative* and *governing* powers, have a figurative personality ascribed to them by this fanciful writer. To his Platonism, not to his religion, we attribute his doctrine on this subject. The following passage may be considered as a very clear expression of his real meaning:

"For God perceiving before-hand, by means of his Deity, that there could never be a good copy without a good pattern, nor any sensible object, such as not to deserve censure, unless it should correspond to an idea in the understanding as its archetype, having determined to form this visible world, first formed an intellectual one, that using as a model that which was incorporeal and most divine in its nature, he might complete the corporeal and newer one as an exact resemblance of the older; containing in it as many species of sensible things as the other did of intellectual (i. e. of those which existed in the understanding only). The world, which consists of ideas only, it would not be right in speaking or thinking to confine to any place, *but we shall understand how it exists by considering a similitude taken from our own affairs.* When a city is about to be founded by the munificence of a king, or of any ruler possessing sovereign power, and adorning his good fortune by a disposition to liberality, there comes some person, skilful in architecture, and having considered the advantages which the situation affords, first delineates within himself almost all the parts of the intended city, its temples, gymnasia, &c. Then the images of each being impressed, as it were on wax, in his own mind, he thus forms an *intellectual* city, of which, exciting again the forms in the memory with which he is furnished by nature, and thus impressing them yet more strongly, like a good workman looking to his pattern, he begins to construct a proper union of stone and wood, conforming the material objects one to each of the immaterial ideas. And thus, in a great degree, are we to think concerning God, who having determined to found this great city, first conceived in his mind its forms, from which, having constructed an intellectual world, he made use of it as a pattern in forming the sensible world. In like manner, then, as in the case of the architect, the preconceived city has no external existence, but is only impressed on the mind of the artificer, so neither has the ideal world any other place than the Divine *word, (logos,* reason or intellect,) which arranged all things—for what other place could there be among the divine powers fit for receiving, I will not say all ideas, but even any one of the simplest? . . . . *But if any one should wish to employ plainer words, he would say, that the intellectual world* (the world of ideas existing only in the Divine mind) *is nothing different from the* LOGOS *of God creating the world:* for neither is the intellectual city any thing

different from the reasoning (or meditation λογισμος) of the architect designing to build the city, conceived in his mind."—(Philo de Mundi Opificio, pp. 3—5, ed. Turn. et Hoesch.)

We add a short extract from another treatise :

" God is the first light: and he is not only light, but the archetype of all other light; rather is elder and more exalted than the archetype, having the *word* as his copy—for the copy, his most perfect word, is light, but he himself is like no created thing."—(De Somniis, p. 576, ed. T. et H.)

Again,

" Moses says expressly that man was formed after the image of God, but if the part (i. e. man, who is but a small part of the world) is an image of *the image*, (i. e. of *the word*, which is an image or transcript of God himself, and which Philo means to say that Moses referred to, when he affirmed that man was made in the image of God,) without doubt the whole species, this whole sensible world is so too, which is a better resemblance than the human one of the Divine image; but it is evident that the archetypal image, (image or reflection of God himself, giving form to all other things,) which we call the intellectual (or ideal) world, must itself be the pattern of the forms of things, the idea of ideas, the Word of God."—(De Mundi Opificio, p. 5, ed. T. et H.)

Once more :

" For nothing mortal can be formed after the image of the Supreme Being, the father of all, but after that of the second God, who is his *word*."—Liber I. Questionum et Solutionum apud Eusebium, Præp. Evang. Lib. vii. Cap. xiii.

Comparing this last with the preceding passage in which the *logos* is said to be the God in whose image man was made, at the very moment when this same *logos* is explained to be the ideal world conceived by God before his creation of the sensible world, and, therefore, having no existence but as a distinct conception of the Divine mind, no deity but as identical with God himself, we obtain just notions as to the real meaning of this author's obscure and figurative mode of expression, and plainly perceive, that though this kind of language may have prepared the way for the corruption of Christianity, it is not used by Philo himself to express any thing analogous with the doctrines of reputed orthodoxy. We might confirm the view we have given of the figurative character of what he says of the *logos* by reference to several of his statements on kindred subjects, as his describing the world as the *only* and *beloved son* of God and his *wisdom*, (De Temulentia, p. 244, ed. T. et H.,) and his representing the *thoughts* and *determinations* of wise men as their *spiritual children* (de Vita Contemplativa, p. 899, ed. T. et H.), which surely afford a sufficient comment on his calling the *word* the son and the first-born son of God. It is observable, that although, in a passage just referred to, he calls the *sensible world* the son of *God* and his *Wisdom*, in another place he calls the logos, i. e. *the ideal world*, the pattern according to which the sensible one was formed, by the same name, which is enough to prove that the title is figuratively used. Many of Dr. S.'s extracts from Philo, which indeed include most of those we have produced, will be found strongly supporting the view we have given of his doctrine, and all of them, we think, when examined in their connexion, will harmonize with it. Dr. S. himself has fairly stated, that

" The Word is represented as being the same to the Supreme Intellect that speech is to the human; and as being the conception, idea, or purpose of the Creator, existing in the Divine mind previously to the actual formation

of his works.—If," he proceeds, "this paragraph were to be taken absolutely and without restriction as a key to the other parts, our inquiry would be answered; and it would be summarily decided that all those other attributives are nothing but personifications and allegories, thus variously and fancifully representing the single idea of the original and eternal PLAN OF DESIGN of the Infinite *Intelligence*."—Script. Test. Vol. I. p. 595, 2nd ed.

Such has, in fact, been the decision of some of the ablest men who have applied themselves to the subject—of Basnage, Souverain, Nye, and, above all, of Mosheim,* not now to mention others. What then is the argument by which Dr. S. attempts to resist this conclusion?

"This hypothesis," he says, "would involve the charge on the writer before us of an extravagance and luxuriance of imagination and diction, which might challenge all parallel among authors having the smallest pretensions to sobriety of thought.—But Philo was no such preposterous writer. Unjustifiable and of injurious tendency as is his favourite principle of interpretation, that principle may be traced to the ambition of *moulding revealed theology according to his system of philosophy*. It is, likewise, observable that his doctrine concerning the WORD is, in a great measure, conveyed in the form of *interpretations* of the supposed allegories of Scripture: and those interpretations are *professedly* given as the *literal* meaning of the allegories. But no sane writer could give interpretations of alleged enigmas in terms equally enigmatical with the things to be interpreted, or even more so."—Ibid. p. 596, 2nd ed.

We cannot say what may be the value of Philo's pretensions to *sobriety of thought*, but we have quoted at length a passage in which he represents the six cities of refuge as really meaning the Divine Logos and five other divine attributes; yet we have also quoted his own declaration, that neither this divine logos nor these attributes are in any strict sense distinct from God himself, or have any existence but as properties of his nature. Perhaps to those who consider the distinction he draws between popular and philosophical modes of speaking on the subject, and who call to mind the extravagancies and inconsistencies with which his allegories abound, there may not appear any thing very wonderful in what Dr. S. regards as impossible; at all events, the fact is before us. In accommodation to a favourite system of philosophy, and under the idea that the doctrine of the pure and simple unity of God could only be comprehended by the most refined and contemplative minds, Philo habitually attributed to certain qualities and energies of the Divine nature a sort of figurative personality, and never scrupled in forming his allegories to speak of them as, *in a certain sense*, distinct; but we must take his own explanation of what he really meant by this language, from which we learn that the *word*, the *creative*, and other powers, stand in much the same relation to the Divine Mind, that thoughts and volitions do to the human mind.

The reason given by Dr. S. for identifying the *logos* of Philo with the Messiah, that "otherwise it must be admitted that this writer has made no mention of the Messiah at all," is most extraordinary, the want of other notices than can be imagined to be conveyed by his use of this term being, in fact, a sufficient proof that he either was not much impressed with the hope of his countrymen, or had some reason for avoiding its introduction in his philosophical allegories.

---

* The learned reader will immediately perceive how much we are indebted to the note of this distinguished man on the opinions of Philo, in his edition of Cudworth's Intellectual System.

The notion of a double sense of the term *logos*—a philosophic, in which it signifies the Divine intellect, or what is conceived in the Divine mind, and a religious, in which it refers to a divine person, cannot be defended otherwise than by shewing either that there are inconsistencies in the use of the term which cannot be reconciled without such an assumption, or that there are titles and epithets given to the logos which, *necessarily* implying distinct personality, cannot belong to the *same* logos, which the author affirms to have been no more than the conception or purpose of the Creator. Now the inconsistencies of Philo on this subject relate to no essential point, and are really very trifling, considering his character as a writer; and in the long train of titles ascribed to the logos in different parts of his work, we do not observe one which is really inconsistent with merely figurative personality. If the WORD is called God, so, more than once, is the *creative power:* all such expressions as the *shadow*, *image*, *express image of the seal* of God, are peculiarly appropriate to the view we have given of Philo's doctrine: the word *angel* is often used by this writer to signify only a manifestation or medium of action, and affords no proof whatever of real personal existence: other personal titles are merely figurative, illustrating the action or office of the personified *Word* in particular instances, and forming parts of particular allegories.

Upon the whole, the philosophy which appears in the writings of Philo may have been common among his more learned countrymen, especially at Alexandria; it may possibly have had some influence on the language of the New Testament, and we do not doubt its having been the original source of those corruptions of Christianity which now assume the name of orthodoxy; but that in the hands of the Jewish philosopher, or even of the earlier Christian fathers, it meant any thing resembling the modern doctrine, we must altogether deny, and we think we have justified this denial by abundant evidence.

Dr. S.'s remaining section is on the Rabbinical writings:

"That the Jews," he says, "in the middle ages, and their successors of the present day, have looked for only a human Messiah, it would be superfluous to prove. . . . . But it is not impossible that in the writings of this unhappy people, some remains may be discoverable of their better and earlier faith."

It may be readily granted, that if we are determined to believe that their earlier faith was different from their present, and was more to our taste, we may in the examination of writings so mystical and obscure as theirs, find something like support for almost any doctrine which pleases us; but the consideration that the modern Jews, who respect these writings and have much better means for understanding them than we have, find nothing in them inconsistent with their own opinions, ought surely to have some little weight with us. Dr. S. proceeds to give an account of the *book Zohar* or *book of light*, said to have been compiled from the sayings of Rabbi Simeon, the son of Jochai, a celebrated Jew, supposed to have been born before the destruction of Jerusalem. "Being unable," he tells us, "to read this book with sufficient intelligence, I have recourse to the more easy method of extracting passages from the ample collections of Schoettgenius." Our own acquaintance with the Zohar being derived from the same source as Dr. S.'s, we shall not say a word on the controversy respecting its real age, or the extent to which it has been interpolated, but we are prepared to maintain, on his own evidence, that Schoettgenius was mistaken in attributing to the

author of this book, and to other Jewish writers, a belief in the Divine Nature of the Messiah, or in any of the mysteries of modern Christian orthodoxy. We take as a fair specimen of the whole the evidence of the application of the names *Jehovah*, *Shechinah*, and *Holy and blessed God*, to the Messiah. 1. Jehovah. "This essential name of God is applied to the Messiah, Jerem. xxiii. 6, (Jehovah our righteousness,) upon which place see what is said in the 2nd book."*

"Zohar Deuter, fol. 119, col. 473, '*In another place the learned in our traditions have taught that* THE TEMPLE *and the* NAME *of the* MESSIAH *may be called by the name of the Tetragrammaton* (i. e. Jehovah).'"—(Schoettgenius, Horæ Hebr. et Talm., Vol. II. p. 4.) It is strange that the application of a name equally to the *temple* and the *name of the Messiah*, should be thought to prove any thing respecting the Messiah's *nature*. "Zohar, in Exod. fol. 21, col. 33. The words of Exod. xiii. 21, '*And Jehovah will go before them*,' are explained of the matron and the angel of the covenant, which I shall shew to be names of the Messiah.'"—(Schoettg. loc. cit.) We need not now inquire into the meaning of the mystical term *matron* in the Zohar. The object of the comment is the remark that it was not Jehovah himself, who could not be more in one place than another, but some symbol of his presence, or perhaps, in the estimation of the metaphysical commentator, some emanation from him which really accompanied the people. The next argument is a very strange one. "Midrasch Tehillim ad Ps. cvii. fol. 40, 1, in reference to the words of Isaiah xxxv. 10, '*And the redeemed of Jehovah shall return.*' *He does not say, the redeemed of Elias, nor the redeemed of the Messiah: but the redeemed of Jehovah.* It is evident here that the redeemed of the Messiah and the redeemed of Jehovah are considered as synonymous."—(Schoettg. loc. cit.) Doubtless the same persons would be intended by the redeemed, whether of Elias, the Messiah, or Jehovah, either of the former being able to redeem only by the aid and authority of Jehovah; but the identity of the Messiah and Jehovah no more follows than that of Elias and Jehovah. Lastly, "Midrasch Tehillim, fol. 57, 1, *Rabbi Huna said, the Messiah is called by eight names, which are, Jinnon, Jehovah, our righteousness*, &c.; because the words יהוה צדקנו (Jehovah our righteousness) are here counted as two names,

---

* On turning to the passage referred to we find several extracts from Jewish books. Echa rabbathi, fol. 59, 2: "What is the name of the king Messiah? Rabbi Abbas, the son of Cahana, said, Jehovah is his name." It is difficult to judge of this without seeing what precedes and follows it, but it probably refers to this very passage of Jeremiah, understood as explained in the following extracts: Rabbi Joseph Albo in Sepher Ikkarim: "The Scripture calls the name of the Messiah, *Jehovah our righteousness*, because he is the mediator of God, through whom we obtain justification from God." Kimchi: "The Israelites shall call their Messiah by the name *Jehovah our righteousness*, because in his times the righteousness of God towards us will be firm and well established." Midrasch Tehillim ad Psa. xxi. 1: "God calls the king Messiah by his own name. But what is his name? The answer is found Exod. xv. 3, *Jehovah is a man of war*. But it is said concerning the king Messiah, *and this is his name*" (referring to Jer. xxiii. 5). The meaning of this evidently is, that God himself could not properly be called a warrior; but the expected Messiah, expected by the Jews as a warlike deliverer, is said by Jeremiah to be called *Jehovah our righteousness*; he may, therefore, be intended by *Jehovah the warrior*, it being understood, of course, in both places, not that the Messiah *was* Jehovah, but that Jehovah *acted by him*. The argument for the application of the passage rests entirely on the Messiah *not being* Jehovah, but honoured with his *name* as his representative.

whereas in reality they are but one, perhaps the modern Jews have expunged one which might be ascertained by a collation of copies."—(Schoettg. loc. cit.) If this remark be correct, the whole force of the passage is destroyed, since the object is to prove that the Messiah is called Jehovah, not by the symbolical name "Jehovah our righteousness," which would not convey the least hint of identity with Jehovah. And whether the passage has been altered or not, it is evident from what has been already said, that the application of the name could not be intended to express participation in nature. This is the whole Rabbinical evidence adduced by Schoettgenius to prove that the Jews expected their Messiah to be Jehovah: it is perfectly worthless.

The word *Shechinah* was used by the Jews to express any manifestation of the Divine presence or energy. It is not a name of God, but of the symbols of his presence on earth, and might without impropriety be applied to men enabled by him to act in an extraordinary manner, as well as to a bright cloud or a burning bush. It will be enough for us to notice one passage from the Zohar, upon which Schoettgenius chiefly relies. "Zohar, Gen. fol. 88, col. 343: "This son is the faithful shepherd. Concerning thee it is said, Ps. ii. 12, '*kiss the son*,' and ver. 7, '*thou art my son*.' But he is the Prince of Israel, the Lord of things below, the chief of ministering angels, the Son of the Most High, the Son of the holy and blessed God, and *the gracious Shechinah*."—(Schoettg. Horæ Heb. et Talm. Vol. II. p. 6.) The last expression means the gracious manifestation of God's favours to his people. It is not a personal appellation, and is therefore no proof of the Messiah's participation in divine names. With respect to the third title, "Zohar, Genes. fol. 63, col. 249," is quoted thus: "And the King Messiah, who is called by the name of the holy and blessed God." (Schoettg. Horæ Heb. et Talm. Vol. II. p. 8.) It may be enough in illustration of the sense in which this is said, to quote from Bava-bathra, fol. 75, 2, words elsewhere alleged by Schoettgenius: "There are three things which receive the name of the holy and blessed God himself, namely, *the Just*, the *Messiah, and Jerusalem*."—(Apud Schoettg. Vol. II. p. 205.) After reading this, will any man in his senses suppose that Jewish writers understood being called by the name of the Most High to imply any participation in his nature?

We conclude that there has been no proof afforded either from the Zohar or from other Rabbinical works, that the Jews at any period expected their Messiah to be a partaker in the Divine Nature. We think we have shewn that Dr. S. has totally failed in his endeavours to deduce, either from the Old Testament or from Jewish writings of a later date, any evidence favourable to his doctrine; and that he cannot carry forward to the examination of the Christian Scriptures themselves, even the slightest reasonable presumption in behalf of the views which he so ingeniously and learnedly labours to establish.

PART II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Dr. S.'s third book, which occupies the whole of his second volume, is employed in considering the "Information to be obtained concerning the Person of THE CHRIST from the Narratives of the Evangelical History, and from our Lord's own Assertions and Intimations." It is not possible for us to enter as minutely into the examination of the remaining as we have done of the preceding parts, nor do we think that it is at all required. We shall produce sufficient specimens relating to important points, and bringing into view, in some instances at least, the claims of Mr. Belsham, as well as the general merits of the controversy.

Among Dr. S.'s introductory observations we find the following:

"That Jesus Christ was and is really and properly a *man*, is maintained by the orthodox as strenuously as by the Unitarians. To bring evidence in proof of this point is, on either side, unnecessary; unless it were conceded that proper humanity implies necessarily a mere humanity; or in other words, that it is *impossible* for the Deity to assume the human nature into an indissoluble union with himself. Such a union, let it be carefully remembered, is not a transmutation of either nature into the other; nor a destruction of the essential properties of either; nor a confusion of the one with the other. The question of such a union is a question of *fact:* and its proper, its only evidence, is Divine Revelation."

The question of such a union *is* a question of *fact:* by Unitarians it is always so treated. They cannot be blind to the strangeness and antecedent improbability of the doctrine, but their difficulties will be overcome by the clear and direct evidence of Divine Revelation. What they allege is, that no such evidence has been or can be produced, that in fact the contrary doctrine is as plainly *taught* in Scripture as any thing can be taught which had never been denied, and can therefore only be incidentally recognized as true. When they quote passages in which our Lord is spoken of as a man, they produce them not merely as testimonies to real and proper humanity, but as instances in which, from the nature of the case, it is *impossible to conceive* of one who believed him to have also had a divine nature, having withheld the expression of that belief, and *therefore* as proofs that no such belief was entertained by those to whom alone we can look for information. The argument is not merely that Jesus is called a man, but that, whilst God-man and all equivalent expressions are unknown to Scripture, he is called a man *in immediate reference to his most extraordinary powers and most exalted offices*, without a hint being added in those places of any superior nature united with the human; and this we contend

is absolutely inconsistent with the reputedly orthodox doctrine. We may distinguish as nicely as we please what is or is not implied in the union of natures, but it is evident that either all that is ascribed to Jesus belongs to his whole person including both natures, which is altogether inconsistent with his declared ignorance respecting the day of judgment, his inability to do any thing of himself, the merely human affections at times attributed to him, and, in short, with almost every page of his history; or else we need some sufficient test for distinguishing what belongs to each nature, and must in every instance apply it so as to determine whether one or the other or both together be in that place intended—a position which involves the Scriptures in inextricable confusion, and would almost reduce to nonsense some of its most interesting and instructive pages. To offer separate proofs of the divine and human natures of our Lord, even if it were possible, would not be sufficient. Such passages standing by themselves could only be considered as either unintelligible or contradictory. We are bound to require direct and positive evidence of the union of the two natures, and we reasonably expect this to be accompanied by abundant indirect indications of the influence of that doctrine on the minds of those who have recorded our Lord's actions and discourses. Nothing, certainly, of this kind has been produced, and without it there is no other species of evidence, even if much better in quality than it actually is, which can be sufficient to establish the orthodox doctrine.

We must now direct the reader's attention to the 4th section of our author's 3rd chapter. It is intended to shew that "the person of Christ, equally with that of the Father, surpasses human knowledge." The argument is drawn from Matt. xi. 27, thus translated by Dr. S.: "All things have been committed to me by my Father; and no one knoweth perfectly the Son except the Father; neither doth any one know perfectly the Father, except the Son, and he to whom the Son may be pleased to unveil [this knowledge];" and John x. 15, "As the Father knows me, even so I know the Father."

From the passage in the Gospel of Luke parallel to that here quoted from Matthew, ("No man knoweth *who the Son is* except the Father, and who the Father is except the Son,") Dr. S. concludes that the knowledge spoken of "refers primarily to the *nature* and *person* of the Father and the Son," which, he says, "nullifies the Calm Inquirer's interpretation of the words." He considers the passages quoted as "including *statements of truth*," of which we shall endeavour to give the substance.

"1. That the communication to mankind of the doctrines which refer to their highest interest in knowledge, holiness, and happiness, is, by a constitution of Divine Wisdom, made the province of the Messiah, as the Mediator between God and man." "2. That this knowledge of the Father and knowledge of Christ are expressed in the way of a perfect *reciprocity*. The description and properties of the one are the description and properties of the other; without limitation on the one side, or extension on the other." "3. That in relation both to the Father and the Son this knowledge is not attainable by the ordinary means of human investigation; it is fundamental to a saving and practical knowledge of true religion; it has its seat in the affections as well as in the intellect; and it is here affirmed to be a special communication of Divine influence." "4. That this knowledge, as existing in the state of communication from Christ to any of mankind *to whom the Son may be pleased to reveal* it, though the same in kind, cannot be imagined to be the same in *degree* or *extent;* unless it be assumed that the capacity and attainment of the instructed must, as a matter of course, be equal to those of

the INSTRUCTOR." "5. Had the member of the sentence which introduces the Son as the object of knowledge been wanting," the remaining part of the passage would have been supposed to refer "to the peculiar glories of the Divine Being, or THAT which distinctively constitutes him God." It would have been understood "that the Infinite Majesty and Perfection of the Adorable Supreme, as distinguished from the imaginary deities of the Heathen world, were revealed and demonstrated by the Christian religion alone. Restore, then, the clause which has been withdrawn; and will not fairness of interpretation require us to accept it as *equally* attributing to the Son *the same* Infinite Majesty and Perfection?"

On a very slight foundation a considerable superstructure is here raised. We admire the ingenuity of the artist, but it is our business to try the stability of the work. In the first place, let us refer to the *nullified* comment of Mr. Belsham on Matt. xi. 27, and Luke x. 22.

"It is plain that he to whom the Son reveals the Father, knows the Father. But what can a man thus learn of God? Nothing, surely, but his revealed will. In the same sense, precisely, the Son knows the Father, i. e. he knows his will, his thoughts, and purposes of mercy to mankind. And the Father alone knows the Son, knows the nature, the object, and the extent of his mission. See John i. 18, x. 14, 15."

Mr. Belsham here manifestly uses *will* rather to express the design of God's providence, that which he intends to accomplish, than what he requires from his creatures, or at least he includes what Dr. S. calls the *decretive* as well as the *preceptive* part of the Divine will. To the objection that this is not all which a man can learn of God by revelation, we might reply, that the knowledge of the excellencies and perfections of God's nature being only interesting and useful to us in connexion with his commands and his designs respecting us, and being only in this way necessary to piety and happiness, it is not to be accounted distinct from the *will* of God in the general sense in which the Calm Inquirer used that term, and was in fact included by him, *revealed will* being opposed to metaphysical nature and essence; but it is sufficient to shew that Mr. Belsham's interpretation of the Evangelist's meaning is approved by the most judicious commentators, and is not in the least affected by our author's objections to it. We quote first from Rosenmüller's Scholia:

"Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου (All things are delivered unto me of my Father)—*All things* which are to be done or taught for the salvation of men, *my Father hath made known unto me.* I have no doubt that παραδιδόναι in this place means *to teach, to reveal,* [in which sense the Heb. כתן very frequently occurs in the Rabbinical writings,] on account of the following words, for Christ says that the revelation of all mysteries relating to human salvation is entrusted to him: οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ (and no man knoweth the Son but the Father)—*No one hath yet understood the nature of the office committed to the Messiah but the Father.* Υἱὸς *(the Son)* is here put concisely for that which was committed by the Father to the Son to be done or taught: and ἐπιγινώσκειν here denotes accurate knowledge. Οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τὶς ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς (neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son)—*Nor does any man except the Son fully understand the decrees and counsels of the Father,* relating to the salvation of the human race. Respecting the sense of τὸν πατέρα (the Father) the same thing is to be remarked which we have before observed of *the Son.* Even the prophets had but a very imperfect view of the things which they predicted on these subjects: καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι (and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him). This is to be referred equally to what

is known of the Father and of the Son. For it was left to the wisdom of the Son both to what persons, and to what extent, and at what time, he would communicate this knowledge."—J. G. Rosenmüller, Schol. in Nov. Test. ed. 3d, Vol. II. p. 169.

We shall next give the principal points in Kuinoel's annotation :

" *My Father hath delivered all things to me.* The discourse is here concerning divine instruction and the explanation of the divine counsels, as the whole connexion shews—the sense of the words is, ' those things which I teach I owe entirely to my Father : he hath delivered to me his own instruction in all its parts.' *And no one hath so accurately known the Son,* what sort of a person I am, and what is the nature of the office entrusted to me, *except the Father ; nor hath any one so accurately known the Father,* what is the degree of intercourse between me and my Father, what are the plans of my Father concerning the salvation of men to be effected through me, *except the Son, and he on whom the Son shall choose to bestow this knowledge,* which last words must be referred to each of the preceding clauses. No one, Jesus declares, can know these things unless taught by me. Whence he establishes that he is the true teacher, from whom every one is able, and ought, to receive salutary instruction."—Kuinoel, Comm. in Nov. Test. Vol. I. pp. 355, 356.

And in like manner Wetstein :

" Although those Jewish doctors despise my humble condition, you think more justly : you believe that I am the only partaker in the secret things of God, and have been sent by him that I might shew the way of salvation ; that those who depart from me depart from the light, and cannot truly understand God the Father, though they boast that they know him."*

But Dr. S. thinks that the words of the parallel passage in Luke, *who the Son is, who the Father is,* prove that the text must be understood of knowledge of the *nature* and *person* of the Father and the Son. Cannot then the words, *who the Son is,* be at least as readily understood—what are his *character, office, and the nature of his mission,* as what are his *nature* and *person ?* Does not the context direct us to that interpretation ? And is not the other evidently suggested, not by the words and connexion, but by the opinion received as true, that there is some mystery respecting the person of Christ ? A judicious and learned commentator, whom we have quoted above, thus explains the words of Luke : " *Who the Son is,* for what purpose and with what power he is sent. *Who the Father is,* how good, how just, how wise he is, what are his plans in giving salvation to men, or at least depriving them of excuse, if they should reject it."—J. G. Rosenmüller, Scholia in Nov. Test. Vol. II. p. 102.

In the passage quoted from John x. 15, the word *know* is most probably to be understood in the sense of *love, regard with distinguishing affection,* a sense derived from the Hebrew, (see Bloomfield, Recens. Synopt. and Kuinoel in loc.,) and the 15th verse must be taken in connexion with the 14th, thus : " I am the good shepherd : and I know my sheep, and am known of mine, as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father : and I lay down my life for the sheep."

---

* We add Grotius's note : " *No one knoweth the Son but the Father*—the Father only who hath ordained it from eternity, knoweth what the Son is to do and suffer, and what glory is reserved for him. *Nor doth any one know the Father save the Son*—the Son only partakes in the counsels of the Father as to the manner in which he will arrange the calling of the Jews first, and then of the Gentiles."

It appears, then, that Mr. Belsham's note gives an excellent sense, such as the connexion would seem to require, is confirmed by a fair consideration of the parallel passage, and is in accordance with the sentiments of the most judicious and generally approved commentators, whilst it is our author who is here chargeable with giving an unusual, far-fetched, and forced interpretation. We will now offer one or two remarks *on the statements of truth* which he finds included in the passages under consideration, and first as to the *perfect reciprocity* of the knowledge of the Father and the knowledge of Christ.

"Is it conceivable," asks Dr. S., "that a wise and good teacher, conscious of no dignity above that which was strictly and merely human, would select, for the purpose of conveying what might have been expressed in plain words, language which unquestionably describes himself and the Eternal Being by *equivalent* and *convertible* terms?"

We answer, all Christians believe their Lord to have been *conscious of a dignity* NOT MERELY *human*, though we understand it to have been a dignity of *office* and *powers*, not of *nature*. Nevertheless, we insist that the meaning we ascribe to the words of Christ, could *not* have been well expressed *more plainly* according to the idiom of his country, and is by no means difficult to be discerned in our times. Precisely in the same manner as when the disciples were exhorted to *be perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect*, they and the Eternal are described in equivalent and convertible terms; our Lord and the God who sent him are certainly here so spoken of; but no conclusion can be drawn in the one case which would not be equally just in the other, and the attempt to infer the identity of the knowledge spoken of in kind and extent, is altogether unreasonable and extravagant.

It is perfectly true that the knowledge here spoken of is represented as not attainable by the ordinary means of human investigation: it is the subject of Revelation: but when Dr. S. says, that "it is here affirmed to be a special communication of *Divine influence*," he affirms that for which he has no warrant in the fair interpretation of the passage. Jesus spoke of the actual state of things. Certain knowledge respecting the Messiah's office and the Father's plans, was not then possessed at all justly and correctly by those who made great pretensions to it. The Father had reserved to himself the exact knowledge of the nature of the Son's mission: the Son alone was admitted to the full understanding of the Father's designs, and this he was to communicate to whom he pleased, to his chosen followers; but being communicated, and the communication recorded for the benefit of mankind at large, no farther revelation to individuals is to be expected, or is at all hinted at in our Lord's words. Again, in reference to our author's fourth position, it was the actual knowledge respecting the true character of the gospel dispensation, which had hitherto been kept secret, which our Lord undertook to reveal to such as he should choose for that purpose. Dr. S., who had just before been contending for a perfect reciprocity and co-extension of the knowledge of God and Christ, now finds room for differences in *degree* and *extent*, according to the different capacities of the *instructed* and *instructor*. Of course, the truths communicated would not be equally well apprehended by all, but the plain sense of the passage is, that it was the very knowledge, and the whole of it, respecting the true nature of the Messiah's office, and the Divine purposes in his mission for the salvation of men, which had not before been possessed,

which Christ undertook now to communicate to his disciples, and which they afterwards gave proofs of their having received and fully understood. Lastly, if the clause respecting the Son, as the object of knowledge, were removed, and, of course, the passage were taken entirely out of its connexion, Dr. S. thinks it would be understood, "that the Infinite Majesty and perfection of the adorable Supreme, as distinguished from the imaginary deities of the Heathen world, were revealed and demonstrated by the Christian religion alone;" and, therefore, he argues, when the clause respecting the knowledge of the Son is inserted, the passage must be taken "as *equally* attributing to him the *same* Infinite Majesty and Perfection." Now leaving out the clause respecting the Father's knowledge of the Son, the kind of knowledge of God intended, would be to be inferred, in a considerable degree, from the connexion, and the words being addressed to Jews, and spoken in reference to Jews, could not certainly be explained of the knowledge of the Great Supreme as distinguished from Heathen deities, but must have been interpreted of the real and correct knowledge of his character and dispensations in opposition to errors prevailing among those who supposed that they understood these subjects; but granting Dr. S.'s interpretation in *the supposed case*, what sort of logic is it which argues that because, leaving out an important member of a sentence, and considering what remains, independently of its context, it might be supposed to have a certain meaning, therefore that is the true meaning, and must be applied to explain the very member, without removing which it could not have been found out? We are astonished that any man can pretend, by such a mockery of reasoning, to afford support to a doctrine so manifestly requiring the clearest and most direct evidence to overcome our justifiable scruples, so stupendous in itself, and so important in all its consequences.

We will now turn to the 6th section of the same chapter, John x. 24—38, including the words, "I and my Father are one." We will first endeavour correctly to represent the nature of Dr. S.'s argument, and to note his concessions, after which but few remarks from us will be needed.

"In this portion of the doctrine of Jesus we find the following particulars: 1. The avowal, so often made, on other occasions, of his *official subordination* to the Father."—[We do not find any such expression as *official* subordination in Scripture: to our apprehension the language of the New Testament expresses *real* and *complete* subordination, the sense of authority which was only derived, powers which were only communicated, and of a course of prescribed duty which must be accomplished. We have read of a feudal prince doing homage for a portion of his territories to a sovereign whom he equalled or exceeded in real power, and whom he shewed that he considered himself at least to equal, even whilst rendering to him a formal act of obeisance; this is our idea of merely *official* subordination, but it is not our understanding of the words of Christ, when he ascribes all his works to his Father, declares that he can do nothing of himself, and expressly affirms that his Father is greater than he. If it were, we could hardly retain our reverence for his character or our confidence in his instructions.] "2. The assertion of *his own power to confer* the blessings of salvation——the bestowment of which implies the attribute of All-sufficiency in the donor."—[We deny that there is here any assertion of our Lord's *own*, i. e. his independent, power to communicate any blessings, at least we find ourselves utterly incapable of perceiving any such meaning of what seem to us very plain words: *The works which I do* IN THE NAME OF MY FATHER, *they testify concerning me. But*

ye believe not: for ye are not of my sheep. As I said unto you, my sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand. MY FATHER, *who gave them to me,* IS GREATER THAN ALL; *and no one is able to snatch them out of the hand of my Father.* It is surely evident that Christ gives as the *ground* of his confidence, that his sheep should never perish, that his Father is greater than all. He felt that he could give a positive assurance, for he knew that he was supported by the power of God himself. This is the natural and sufficient meaning of the words; and to suppose that he claims *independent* power, is arbitrary with respect to this passage, as it is directly opposed to others.]—"3. This assurance of security is repeated, with a confirmatory declaration that the *Omnipotence* of the Almighty Father is pledged to the same object."—[As there can be nothing stronger than omnipotence, Christ's own omnipotence was abundantly sufficient, had he claimed or possessed this attribute.]—"4. These two assurances are consolidated into the proposition, *I and my Father* ARE ONE."

Dr. S. here joins himself with those who take this expression as *implying* at least the co-equality and union of nature of Christ and the Father. He concedes, indeed, that in every other passage of the New Testament, where the expression "to be one" is used, (there are two distinct passages, in one of which it occurs several times,) union of affection, or of design and co-operation, is intended. He even grants that if we were to argue from the spurious passage, 1 John v. 7, we should interpret it of CONSENT or union of testimony, but he thinks "that the grammatical sense of the phrase will not, of itself, determine the precise import; and that the meaning must be ascertained in every instance, by our attention to the *nature* and *circumstances* of the given case." The mode of expression in John xvii. 21, &c., and all the circumstances of the case, are so very similar to those in the passage before us, that we can hardly help considering the one as a key to the other: *That they all may be one,* AS *thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us*.....THAT THEY MAY BE ONE AS WE ARE ONE: and the only other instance, 1 Cor. iii. 8, *He that planteth and he that watereth are one,* is a case of exactly the same kind; yet we have no objection to decide the question by attention merely to the nature and connexion of the words immediately under our consideration. Dr. S. goes on,

"What then is the kind of union which the nature and circumstances of the case point out? It is a union for the bestowment of the most important blessings, for the averting of the greatest evils, for a sovereign and effectual preservation from spiritual danger and eternal ruin. *These* are the plain facts of the case. It is, therefore, a union of POWER. *No one shall snatch them out of* MY *hand—No one can snatch them out of* MY FATHER'S *hand—I and the Father are* ONE. The argumentative connexion of the clause requires also to be attended to. Jesus had affirmed the adequacy of *his own* power for the certain salvation of his sincere followers, as well as that of God his Father. Therefore, to shew that he had not exceeded the bounds of truth in the assertion, and to furnish a sufficient ground of reason for it, he adds, *I and the Father are one.* The union of power is thus shewn to be a real *identity* of power."

Our author's argument is pretty exactly expressed by Euthymius:—*ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν· ταυτοδύναμοι, εἰ δε ἕν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν, ἕν ἄρα καὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ἐσίαν, καὶ φύσιν—I and the Father are one, equal in*

power, and if one in power, then one also in godhead, and essence, and nature. The answer is, that Jesus himself *denies* his having the same power with the Father, and describes himself as exercising a communicated and dependent power. *His* reasoning is, No one shall snatch them out of my hand, for no one can snatch them out of my Father's hand; but I and the Father are one. I know his will; I act entirely by his direction; I have reason fully to depend on his support in all that I do.

It is affirmed, that the acts here attributed to Christ require "a power which could be neither communicated to, nor exercised by, any being merely a creature;" but this is mere assumption. Jesus simply declares that, whilst those who *were not of his sheep*, could not be convinced by any evidence offered to them, those who were, would receive and adhere to his religion, and would surely enjoy its eternal blessings, and his confidence in this is expressly founded on his Father's power.

It is farther argued, from the accusation immediately brought by the Jews and our Lord's answer to it, that he must have made some extraordinary assertion of the divinity of his nature. "The hearers of Jesus instantly accused him of assuming DIVINE honours—whether their alarm was sincere or affected, it is clear that there must have been an *apparent* ground for it." The hearers of Jesus took up stones threatening to stone him, and, on being asked the reason, answered, *for blasphemy, and because, thou, being a man, makest thyself God.* Now, considering the character of those who brought it, there can be no doubt that sufficient ground would have been afforded for this charge by our Lord speaking of God as his Father in such a manner as to imply that he was pre-eminently the Son of God. The reply of Jesus shews that he understood this to be the sole ground of the accusation; and had it not been so, his enemies would not have failed to remind him that he had offered no defence of his most offensive expression.

"But," says Dr. S., "upon the Unitarian hypothesis, no motive can be imagined why [our Lord] should not have met the accusation with the clearest and most pointed denial. Though he saw it not to be proper, as yet, to avow himself publicly to be the Messiah, there could be no reason why he should omit to protest that he was merely a man such as other men; and every consideration of piety and veracity and all other good principles, demanded the most prompt and unambiguous declaration against the blasphemy with which he was charged. This course, however, he did not take."

We shall reply to this, by calling attention to the course which Jesus *did* take. He was unwarrantably, maliciously, and notwithstanding that his expressions might easily have been understood, accused of blasphemy, because his calling God *his* Father was represented as a sort of assumption of divinity. The sum of his defence is, "Judges and magistrates are called gods in Scripture, because the word of God was with them, or was addressed to them—because they had to administer justice in his name, or because he had commanded them to plead the cause of the destitute and fatherless, and to govern and protect the poor; this would be allowed to be certainly right, for the Scriptures cannot be made void; how, then, should he, whom the Father had selected as his chosen servant, and sent forth on a mission of grace and truth, which was proved by so many miracles, be accused of impiety for only calling himself *the Son of God?*" The defence clearly shews that he had called himself no more than *the Son of God*, and knew this expression to be the cause of offence, and it justi-

fies the use of it by an eminent servant of God on the supposition of his being, like the magistrates who had been of old called Gods, a human being, in the most satisfactory manner. Since, then, his exculpation was complete, and included a disclaimer of any pretensions founded on any other grounds than having been chosen, authorized, and peculiarly employed by God, it would be great presumption in us to say that it ought to have been made in any terms which might seem to us more precise. It answered its purpose at the time, and if we give it our candid attention we shall not now mistake its meaning. We will notice one more attempt which our author has made to strengthen his case:

"He (Jesus) then appeals to his unquestionable miracles, as the attestation of his truth in again affirming *the very thing* which had created the offence; in terms different, indeed, but clearly of the same import, and most strongly expressive, *not of a union of power merely*, though that involved a claim of omnipotence, [precisely as an officer who arrests a man in the king's name claims for himself the royal authority,] but of a union in the very *nature* and *manner* of existence: IN ME *is the Father and* I IN HIM."

Dr. S. is right, that this expression is of the same import with the other, and he has himself brought forward the unanswerable and irresistible objection to his interpretation of it, in the examples of its use in other places. *In that day*, says our Lord, John xiv. 20, *ye shall know that I am in my Father, and* YE IN ME *and* I IN YOU. *That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us*.....*I in them, and thou in me, that they may be completed into one.* John xvii. 21, 23. *By this we know that we abide in him, and he in us, that he hath given us of his spirit*.....*God is love; and he who abideth in love abideth in God, and God in him.* 1 John iv. 13, 16. Our author attempts to resist this objection, by an appeal to the circumstances of the particular case in which "a oneness of *power* for the performance of works which imply omnipotence," is the subject. We have already shewn that the circumstances of the case imply nothing of this kind. Our Lord is establishing his authority, and he proves it by an appeal to his miracles; but if we interpret the words in which he declares his knowledge of the Divine counsels, and the extraordinary aid he receives from God, of a union of nature, we must in consistency believe also in a union of nature between Christ and his followers, and even between the all-perfect God himself and some of his creatures.

We are astonished at the hardihood with which, in the face of such declarations as these, *As the Father gave me commandment even so I do; The Son can do nothing of himself; I can of mine own self do nothing; The Father that dwelleth in me* HE DOETH *the works;* Dr. S. asserts that "Jesus Christ constantly speaks of himself as being, not an instrument only, but the AGENT, in works of miraculous power." Again, "The apostles ascribed the final agency," in the miracles which sanctioned their ministry, "to Christ as readily as to God the Father," which is justified only by the words of Paul, in Rom. xv. 18, "Christ wrought them through me;" although it is expressly declared that Christ, in his exalted state, had *received of God* the power of communicating miraculous gifts to his disciples, which gifts might, therefore, be in a certain sense properly ascribed to him, though known to be manifestations of the power of God his Father. We must not repeat the evidence, that all who saw the miracles of our Lord considered them as proofs only that *God was with him*, and that his disciples ascribed his and their own powers ultimately to God

alone, but we cannot suppress the expression of unfeigned wonder, that statements should be made in opposition, as it appears to us, to the plainest facts, and yet almost without the appearance of offering any thing in their justification; and that on no better grounds, that we can perceive, than bold and unsupported assertion, Dr. S. should oppose himself to that interpretation of the passage we have been considering, which has been approved, not by Unitarians only, but by Erasmus, Calvin, Bucer, and the great majority of *learned* commentators, however sincere in their attachment to the doctrines of reputed orthodoxy.

We select one more passage, and it is all that our limits will allow, from the volume now before us. It is the first section respecting Christ's descent from heaven, on John iii. 13, "No one hath ascended into heaven, except he who descended from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven." These words, together with the preceding verse, are thus paraphrased by Dr. S.:

"If ye are so averse from apprehending and embracing my testimony with respect to those subjects of religion which refer to your own reason and conscience in the present state, how will ye be capable of understanding those more sublime truths, the knowledge of which is entirely dependent on a revelation from the Deity himself? Yet doubt not my ability to give you correct information even on these exalted themes. No human being, indeed, has ever been, or could be, admitted to that most immediate and perfect manifestation of the Divine Presence, which would communicate to him that knowledge. But the Messiah, whose superior nature is Eternal, Omniscient, and in every respect Divine, has assumed the nature of man for the express purpose of bringing this knowledge and all other divine blessings to your enjoyment."

Here it will be observed, that the first clause is made to contain an absolute assertion, admitting of no exception, to which the remaining part is opposed in the way of contrast. *No* merely human being hath ascended into heaven, i. e. hath had the opportunity of obtaining divine knowledge. On the contrary, the Messiah, who, as to one part of his nature, is not human, who is in heaven, hath descended from heaven, i. e. hath manifested himself in the flesh on earth to bring this knowledge: but the construction of the original requires that the latter part should be considered as an exception to the general declaration in the first clause, and ουδεις (no one) cannot have the emphatic sense, "no *human* being," forced upon it. We *must take* it, "No one hath ascended to heaven, except he who came down from heaven." Since, therefore, he who came down, first ascended, was enabled by some means to *attain to* "that most immediate and perfect manifestation of the Divine Presence, which would communicate to him (divine) knowledge," he could not have possessed it naturally and originally, consequently could not be in nature "Eternal, Omniscient, and Divine." Dr. S. appears to consider the phrases as expressing a real being in heaven, and coming from heaven, but as including and implying the possessing and communicating divine truths. The obvious defect of his interpretation is, that, as he cannot allow Christ to have *ascended* to the place where his divine nature always existed, or to have acquired knowledge which inherently belonged to him, he is obliged to refer the first clause exclusively to others, whereas the original clearly expresses, that though no other ascended to heaven, Christ did ascend; that whatever is meant by being in heaven, whether it is to be taken literally or figuratively, the state it expresses did not always belong to him, but he was enabled to

reach it, and having first ascended, he then descended. This objection, we apprehend, to be fatal to Dr. S.'s peculiar view of the subject; we must, however, consider other modes of explaining the passage, and endeavour to estimate the force of his objections to that generally adopted by Unitarians. We can conceive it possible that all three clauses might be intended literally, all three figuratively, or part literally and part figuratively. Dr. S.'s hypothesis, which we have just considered, takes them all literally so far as supposing them to express an actual *being in heaven*, though as *connoting* the possession of that divine knowledge which is there obtained. The Unitarian explanation takes them all figuratively, supposing the ascent into heaven merely to express being admitted to the knowledge of divine things; the descent from heaven, going forth into the world as an authorized divine messenger to communicate heavenly truths; and being in heaven, the continued reception of divine communications and powers. Most commentators interpret the first clause figuratively in the same manner as the Unitarians do, many take the second, and many the third, literally. The mixture of the literal and figurative senses, though not altogether impossible, is harsh, and not to be resorted to without very strong reasons. In describing the Unitarian scheme, Dr. S. very needlessly introduces the objections made by some to the notion of a *local* heaven, which objections he answers in a manner satisfactory to us; but the question has no more than an accidental connexion with the present subject, and the acknowledgment that there may probably exist a place designated peculiarly as heaven, will not be supposed to imply that that place must be always literally meant whenever the word is used. But Dr. S. says,

"The statement of the Calm Inquirer is not correct when he says, '*To ascend to heaven* is a Hebrew form of expression, to denote the knowledge of things mysterious and remote from common apprehension.' The four passages referred to by him and other writers, evidently signify a real and local ascent, with a view to obtain the knowledge, or other blessing, adverted to in the connexion of each."

The first of these passages is Deut. xxx. 11—13:

"This commandment is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven that thou shouldst say, Who shall ascend for us to heaven and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?"

Our author contends that the succeeding sentence, which in the same manner affirms that the Israelites needed not to make long journeys or perilous voyages to acquire the knowledge of the Divine Will, proves that the words of the former question intend an actual ascent to some celestial region.

It proves that they believed heaven to be a place to which it was *conceivable* that men might ascend, and by reaching which the knowledge which is here unattainable might be supposed to be acquired; but the expressions in both sentences are evidently figurative. Moses illustrates the position that the commandment was neither unintelligible, nor kept from their study, by telling them that they need not inquire after impossible or very difficult means of gaining the knowledge of it; *ascending to heaven* represents the means of obtaining the knowledge of things mysterious, the commandment *being in heaven* signifies being *unintelligible*, beyond the reach of human faculties. 2. Prov. xxx. 4: "That the ascending and descending are here assumed as undoubted properties of the Most High, is manifest from the succeeding question." So says Dr. S.,

but we think a proper consideration of the passage will shew that the majority of commentators who have taken it differently are right. The intention of the writer seems to be to represent the knowledge of God as unattainable by human faculties, and to recommend humility from the consideration of his inconceivable majesty. "Who hath ascended up into heaven or descended?" What mortal hath immediately contemplated the glories of God, and attained to the knowledge of divine things, or hath brought forth such knowledge and communicated it to others? You know that there is none. "Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth?" Is there any man that hath done these things? Or is it not known to all that they are such as the Almighty himself alone can accomplish? If there be man who can perform such wonders, "what is his name, and what is his son's name?" that they may obtain the admiration and celebrity which they deserve. (Vide Job xxxviii. 4, &c.; Isa. xl. 12—14.) This passage, then, is exactly to the purpose, ascending up to heaven and descending being figurative expressions for *acquiring* and *communicating* divine knowledge. 3. Rom. x. 6: "But the justification by faith speaketh thus: Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down." The meaning is: Do not entertain any doubt concerning the divine authority of Christ; do not say, Who shall go to heaven to fetch the Christ down? as if he had not yet been manifested to the world. Do not ask, Who shall obtain for us the blessings of divine knowledge? which you already possess. Lastly, Baruch iii. 29: "Who hath gone up into heaven and taken her, i. e. wisdom, and brought her down from the clouds?" Here the form of expression and the sense are exactly similar to the passage in Exodus. Dr. S. produces other instances of ascent into heaven being spoken of in Scripture, where a real translation to heaven as a place seems to be intended, but these are not to the purpose, as it is not denied that such is the original and proper meaning of the words; it is only contended that they may also bear the figurative meaning assigned, which Mr. B.'s examples appear sufficient to prove.

But Dr. S. continues:

"The Calm Inquirer, on the authority of Dr. Whitby, affirms that 'the Jews in the Targum say in honour of Moses, that *he ascended into the high heavens*, by which they could mean no more than his admission to the divine counsels.' Whitby, perhaps copying from some other author, has not understood the passage, nor even referred to it rightly. It is evident that neither he nor the Calm Inquirer, who borrows it from him, took the pains to consult the Targum. The place is in the paraphrase on Cant. iii. 3, and it very plainly refers to Moses's going up to the top of Mount Sinai to intercede for the people on their having made the golden calf."

He then makes large quotations from the Targum, of which the following specimen is sufficient:

"Moses their leader ascended *to the firmament*, and made peace between them and their king—Moses the chief scribe of Israel answered and spoke thus, *I will ascend to the heavens on high*, and I will pray before Jah, if perhaps he may be propitiated on account of your offences."

No doubt the reference is to ascending the mount, but why is it called ascending *to heaven?* Not, assuredly, as Dr. S. suggests, because the word for *heaven* is sometimes applied to a moderate elevation in the atmosphere,

but because God peculiarly manifested himself on the mount, because Moses was admitted to peculiar intercourse with him, the great purpose of which was that he might learn and communicate his will. We think therefore that, notwithstanding our author's hasty censure of others, and somewhat affected display of his own accurate learning, he has not shewn Whitby to have been in error; Moses' *ascending* certainly meant his going up into the mount, but its being called the *heavens on high*, as certainly meant that it was the immediate presence of Jehovah, admission to his counsels, the power of learning his will, and addressing him with a peculiar assurance of being attended to. The surprise of our author "that Schoettgenius and the other learned persons should not have perceived that they were putting the result for the operation, the consequent for the antecedent, the end for the means to which that end was attributed," is also, we think, much misplaced. *To be in heaven* is to be where we have the opportunity of attaining to the wonders of Divine knowledge, and is hence put for the possession of that knowledge by a figure of a kind than which none can be more common or natural; and it follows of course that to *ascend into heaven*, must mean to be admitted to the means of acquiring such knowledge. Our Lord in using the phrase most probably had the application of it to Moses in his thoughts, meaning to affirm that no prophet or messenger of God, not even the great lawgiver, had been admitted to that complete knowledge of God's purposes and will which he possessed, and which it was the object of his mission to communicate. The figure was the less liable to be misunderstood, as the contrast of *heavenly* and *earthly* things, in the preceding verse, for things familiar, which might be expected to be known, and those which were new, having hitherto remained mysteries, would almost preclude the possibility of mistake. Accordingly there is, as Mr. Belsham observes, a remarkable agreement of commentators of all parties in the interpretation of this first clause, and we cannot anticipate that Dr. S.'s remarks will interrupt its continuance.

The second clause being correlate to the first, it is very harsh to take, as many do, the one figuratively, the other literally; they should certainly be interpreted in reference to one another, and on the same principle. If to ascend into heaven is to obtain the complete knowledge of divine things, to come down from heaven, is to communicate that knowledge by divine authority, to come forth as an authorized teacher of heavenly truth. Dr. S.'s statement, that "from a careful examination of the scriptural use of the expressions *from heaven*, and *being*, *coming*, or *descending from heaven*, it appears that the idea intended is A DIVINE ORIGIN, which is, of course, applied variously according to the nature of the subject," is nearly coincident with Mr. Belsham's, and is sufficient for our purpose, since *divine origin*, the idea being applied according to the nature of the case under our consideration, must mean *divine authority*, as Matt. xxi. 25, "The baptism of John, was it *from heaven or of men?*" It is objected that there is no other instance of a person being said to come from heaven, meaning to bring and communicate truth, or to teach by divine authority. Prov. xxx. 4, as we have explained it, is an example of this use of the phrase; but if there were none, it arises so completely from the connexion and the sense of the preceding clause, that no difficulty need be felt.

The figurative sense of the third clause, *who is in heaven*, "who has received divine communications perfectly qualifying him for his office," follows, of course, (allowing its genuineness, which is not certain, as it is

omitted by some important authorities,) from that of the others, and Dr. S.'s interpretation of it, "who as to his superior nature is in heaven, even whilst he speaks to you on earth," is far more difficult and strange than any figurative one. We have now carefully examined our author's remarks on this very important passage, and we hope it will be perceived that he has done nothing to weaken the force of the criticisms of Mr. Belsham and other eminent men, who have contended for its interpretation as figurative language, but that a full consideration of the subject only confirms and establishes the justness of their views.

With regret we pass by other portions of Dr. S.'s volume, which certainly deserve attention. We have preferred the plan of carefully examining a few articles to that of merely touching upon many, and we venture to assure the reader (we hope that some such will be found) who is, upon the whole, satisfied with what we have done, so far as it goes, that we have not chosen the least difficult portions, and that, should he not possess the requisite knowledge for personal examination, he may judge of the controversial value of the whole from what has been laid before him.

The fourth part of Dr. Smith's work, to which we now proceed, is devoted to the consideration of "the doctrine taught by the Apostles in their inspired ministry, concerning the person of the Lord Jesus Christ." The subjects of the four chapters are, the book of Acts; the testimony of the Apostle John; the testimonies of the Apostles Peter, Jude, and James; and the testimony of the Apostle Paul.

The anxiety shewn by Dr. S., lest the book of Acts should be expected by the reader to contain *a body of Christian doctrine*, appears to us a strong extorted testimony to the impossibility of finding, in this important portion of Scripture, any thing like a satisfactory expression of his favourite sentiments, though he does not fail afterwards to adduce passages which he seems to regard as affording countenance to them.

"The annunciation of his design, which Luke gives in the preface to his Gospel, seems very justly to comprehend both parts of his work: and if this be admitted, it will supply us with a sufficient reason why the book called *the Acts* was drawn up in its particular manner and order; and it will prevent our *disappointment* at *not meeting* with those statements in either history or *doctrine*, which an incorrect estimate of its intention might lead us to expect. Whoever Theophilus, to whom the two books are inscribed, was, it is plain that the writer's design was, not to make him acquainted with the fundamental truths of Christianity, for in them he had been already instructed; but to furnish him with a selection of facts relative to the actions, discourses, and sufferings of the Lord Jesus, and the diffusion of his religion in some particular places, and by some particular persons. Those places and persons, it is highly probable, had some connexion with Theophilus more than other places or persons would have had: and thus some specialty of circumstances was the principle which guided the selection." . . . . .

"As we are not to regard the book of Acts in the light of a regular history, so this view of its design will prevent our expecting from it a body of Christian doctrine. *It supposes the reader to be,* like Theophilus, *already acquainted with the great principles of that doctrine,* and it is therefore occupied in giving him the facts which formed the basis of evidence for those principles, or which were examples of their diffusion and influence among men."—Script. Test. Vol. III. p. 6.

The book of Acts can certainly pretend to no more than being a faithful narrative of some interesting and important particulars respecting the first

preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles and their companions after their Lord's resurrection. Our author's conjecture, as to the principle on which the facts were selected, appears to us arbitrary and fanciful, but it is not material to the argument whether it be true or false. Whether chosen from amongst others, on account of some peculiar power they possessed, from incidental associations, of interesting Theophilus individually, or, as seems far more probable, on account of their intrinsic value, and their suitableness for convincing men's minds, and giving them just views of the religion of Christ, it seems abundantly certain that the facts and discourses recorded by the Evangelist must be sufficient means of making known to any body the fundamental truths of Christianity. It is true, Theophilus had already acquired some knowledge of the Gospel from other sources, but the purpose of the Evangelist was to confirm and establish him in the truth, and to give him a record on which he might rely of authoritative instructions and remarkable facts, containing the principles and the evidence of the religion he had received. No book of Scripture contains any thing which can be called "a body of Christian doctrine."

Our divine religion has been, by the wisdom of God, conveyed to us *historically:* we are to collect its principles and their influences from the study of the discourses and actions of our Lord and his chosen followers. But that there should be a single narrative of any considerable portion of the public ministry of Christ himself, or of his apostles, which should not exhibit the leading and essential truths of his religion, seems altogether incredible and almost inconceivable. All the evangelists wrote their histories for the immediate information of those who had already been convinced of the truth of Christianity and instructed in its doctrines, but it was necessary to give them an authentic record, and it is not to be for a moment supposed that *what were esteemed sufficient,* though very imperfect, memoirs of the words and actions of Christ, could leave untouched any *peculiar* and *characteristic doctrines* of his religion. The same reasoning applies to the book of Acts. It contains only *specimens* of apostolic instruction, but they are fair and sufficient specimens, and we must expect them to put us in possession of the substance of Christian teaching: not to re-state all which was adopted from Judaism, and assumed, as known by Christian preachers, but to give us the peculiarities of the gospel, and to explain the opinions of its promulgators on those points which, from their novelty, their extensive influence, or the prevalence of erroneous views, they deemed it most important to press upon the attention of their hearers. Are the doctrines respecting the person and work of Christ, which now assume the name of orthodoxy, to be classed in this number? If they are, let the plain fact that they are not made *the subjects of instruction* in any part of the book of Acts be accounted for; if they are not, then, even supposing them not to be altogether false and unscriptural, why do modern divines presume to attach to them an importance which apostles and evangelists evidently did not attribute to them?

It is chiefly in an indirect manner that Dr. S. supposes the book of Acts to support his opinions. He has collected its testimony under nine heads. Some of his statements excite our extreme surprise, but we are under the necessity of confining our remarks at present to one or two points. He tells us, first, that the *real humanity* of Christ is here "stated in the clearest terms." This, it seems, is perfectly consistent with the reputedly orthodox doctrine. Yet we certainly feel at a loss to understand how some of the texts here quoted are to be reconciled with that doctrine. We

know it is held that our Lord was truly man as well as truly God, and, therefore, we might expect to find him on some occasions called man, but what is to be thought when he is said to be "a man proved to you to be from God by miracles, wonders, and signs, which God did by him amongst you?" *A man from God—not a God-man—proved to be sent from God by miracles*—which were not his own—were not effected by any part of his own nature, but *which God* (plainly spoken of as a distinct being) *did through him.* To us these words seem absolutely irreconcileable with the doctrine of the two natures, as directly opposed to it as if they had been designed to contradict it. Of this at least we are certain, that if the most perspicuous and appropriate language for designating a *human prophet, divinely commissioned and attested,* were carefully sought out, no words could be found fitter for the purpose than those which the Apostle Peter has employed in this passage, according to common supposition, with so very different a meaning.

Were it necessary, we might apply a similar argument to other remarkable instances in which our Lord is called *a man,* but it would be useless to go on; for those who do not see the force of the reasoning in the case we have been considering, will not be impressed by any thing we might add respecting other passages. We hope it is clear to every reader that here and elsewhere our argument is drawn not from Christ being called a man, but from his being so called *under circumstances, and with explanations, which appear to us inconsistent with the notion of his having been more than man.* It is, therefore, no reply on the part of believers in his deity to say that they also acknowledge his humanity. They are called upon to shew, by suitable and consistent explanation, that we have not good grounds for affirming *the incompatibility of the language used with the admission of any other besides a human nature.* This is what is required, but what we have seen no attempt to accomplish, and firmly believe that no ingenuity can accomplish.

We must now pass to our author's 9th head, which is introduced by the following general statement:

"This book of Acts represents the first Christians as paying religious worship to the Lord Jesus Christ, and that this was a known and acknowledged characteristic of their profession." The particular cases upon which this general statement is founded are, i. the passages which contain the expression, *calling upon the name of the Lord;* ii. the dying words of Stephen; iii. the prayer of the eleven apostles, Acts i. 24; and, iv. the conduct of Paul and Barnabas, Acts. xiv. 23. If the book of Acts does plainly represent the first disciples as paying religious worship to Christ, let its authority have due weight, but we must frankly declare that it is not by any *ambiguous* expressions, or by any circumstances which admit of rational explanation in other ways, that we are to be induced to believe any thing so extraordinary as that he who, whilst on earth, addressed his own prayers to his Father in heaven, and directed the prayers of his disciples to the same great Being, HIS *Father and their Father, his God and their God;* he whom with full conviction we believe to be uniformly described in Scripture as distinct from and inferior to God, and as elevated above men, not by his nature, but by appointed office and communicated powers, ever accepted or allowed that worship from his followers, which it is not pretended to justify by any express injunction of himself or his apostle. We do not profess to come to this inquiry as if it were to be decided by the exclusive consideration of the texts now before us; we openly declare that we shall

avail ourselves, as we feel bound to do, of any uncertainty as to a commonly received construction, or doubt as to the meaning which has been usually assigned to a phrase, to vindicate the *consistency* as well as the reasonableness of what is contained in the Sacred Records, and to avoid placing the doctrine of a few passages in direct contradiction to the general tenor both of precept and example in the evangelical narratives.

The passages first offered to our notice in proof that the worship of Christ is recognized in the book of Acts, are those which contain the phrase, (according to the common translation) *calling upon thy name*, or *upon his name*, applied to Christ. "The Calm Inquirer," says Dr. S., "with the general body of those who hold the same system, besides some other writers inclined to lax opinions,* affirms that 'these words may be rendered, *who are called*, or *who call themselves after thy name*, i. e. who profess themselves thy disciples.'"

It is generally agreed that the expression referred to is a periphrasis for *disciples of Christ:* the question is, how it comes to convey this meaning? —how the sense is to be derived from the words?

If any man, of any sentiments, can honestly declare that after the best attention he can give to the reasoning, precepts, and narratives, found in the New Testament, *he is prepared* to find Christians familiarly spoken of as those who *worship* Christ, we can only express our unfeigned astonishment. We can entertain no doubt that the majority of reflecting readers will well understand the feeling which has led many truly pious and learned men, some of them even believers in the divinity of our Lord's person, to pause and consider whether a phrase, which is manifestly idiomatical and of Hebrew origin, must necessarily be understood as implying so startling a fact as that the disciples addressed *religious worship and supplication* to their glorified Master. There is no doubt that the word ἐπικαλέομαι, literally meaning "to call upon," and hence often, very naturally, "to call for aid," "to implore," is frequently used of *religious supplication* to the Supreme Being. To *call upon God*, or *upon his name*, frequently signifies to *pray to him*—does it thence follow that the notion of *religious* supplication is implied in the word, and that to call upon a man is to worship him? Far from it—the peculiar modification of the signification belongs *not to the word*, but *to the connexion*, and we must be cautious how we apply it. Now it happens that the Greek word, imitating the Hebrew קרא, which it very often represents in the ancient Greek version of the Old Testament, has sometimes the sense of *celebrating, praising, honouring*, and thence *acknowledging the authority* of the person spoken of. It is in these significations that, joined with (ὄνομα) name, it is, we think, often applied to the Supreme Being, and in the same way it may, with strict propriety, be applied to an eminent servant of God. This, we are inclined to think, (agreeing, in the main, with our learned and excellent friend Dr. Carpenter, though we do not like his translation, *who* APPEAL *to the name of Christ,*) is the true sense of the passages under consideration. The other way of taking them, noticed by Dr. S., has, however, strong claims on our attention, and, whether we look to the great authorities by which it is supported,

---

* *Lax opinions!* Of what sort are they? or, if the term is meant as a reproach, where is the authoritative rule to which these writers are accused of not strictly adhering, and how will our author justify his presumption in such a censure whilst he affects to encourage freedom of inquiry?

or to the force of the argument adduced in its favour, is not to be lightly rejected.

The verb ἐπικαλέομαι, though generally used actively *to call upon*, is also capable of meaning *to call oneself*, or *be called*, (Phavorinus apud Schleusner,) which would give an excellent sense to all the passages. The commonness of the expression, with the verb in the *passive* form, applied to *persons* as well as things, *having the name of the Lord called upon them*, for being distinguished as his property, devoted to his service, makes it highly probable that persons might be said to *call upon themselves a name*, in the sense—not of actually bearing that name, as Dr. S., from one of his remarks, (Scrip. Test. Vol. III. p. 36,) seems to have understood it, and which is not at all implied in the phrase—but of openly acknowledging the authority of the person, or numbering ourselves as of his party. It is true, that no precise instance of this use of ἐπικαλέομαι can be found in the ancient Greek version of the Old Testament, but there is an analogous expression with a verb of *the same* form, and nearly *the same* sense, where indeed this verb might be substituted without altering the meaning, in Isa. xliv. 5. The words of the authorized translation are, "One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." Here, in the second and last clauses, we have in the Hebrew יִקְרָא in the unquestionable sense of *calling oneself*, and יִכְנֶה as equivalent with it. Both these words are expressed in the LXX. Greek by βοήσεται will *call himself*, or *be called*, and in each case followed by ὄνομα. This goes very far towards justifying the translation of the New-Testament phrase ἐπικαλέμενοι το ὄνομα, *calling themselves by the name*, in the sense of acknowledging the authority; but there is one other circumstance: the phrase is found in the opening of the 1st epistle to the Corinthians: "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth·····with all that in every place *call upon the name* of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." Now, in the conclusion of his 1st epistle to the Corinthians, Clement of Rome has evidently imitated this apostolic phrase: "May the God who seeth all things, the sovereign of spirits and lord of all flesh, *who hath chosen the Lord Jesus Christ*, and us through him, to be a peculiar people, give to every soul that *is called by* his excellent and holy name, faith, fear, peace," &c.—πάσῃ ψυχῇ ἐπικεκλημένῃ το μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ ἅγιον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ. Here there is no ambiguity. The *passive* participle places the sense beyond doubt, but if Clement is imitating the apostle, he has expressed the same sense by an equivalent form of words—and we are forcibly led to the translation *called themselves by the name*—profess adherence to—in the passage of the apostolic epistle, and, of course, in other similar places. To all this it is replied in substance, that there is no certain example of ἐπικαλεῖσθαι το ὄνομα, with the passive or reciprocal sense of the verb, signifying *to call upon oneself*, or *be called by the name*, whilst there are many unquestionable ones where the same phrase signifies to *call upon the name;* that the other mode of expression referred to—*having a name called upon a person or thing*, is the appropriate one in Scripture for conveying the idea of assuming a name; and that as Acts ii. 21, which cannot be denied to be a key to the other instances in the New Testament, is a quotation from Joel, where the sense certainly is *call upon the name of the Lord*, we cannot fairly refuse to render the other examples in the same manner. We are led by these arguments, though with some little hesitation, to prefer giving

an active sense to the word ἐπικαλέομαι; but we have already stated that this by no means necessarily implies *religious supplication*, and is not happily rendered in English by *call upon*. The passage from Clement is abundant evidence of the equivalence of the passive and active formulas, and therefore leads us to understand the latter, *acknowledging* the name of Christ, viz. that he is our divine Master, deliverer, and instructor. *Calling on the name of the Lord*, in the Old Testament, often means *celebrating, not praying* to him, and this sense is ascribed by the best lexicographers to קרא, which ἐπικαλέομαι represents: examples are, Psa. cv. 1, "O give thanks unto the Lord, call upon, i. e. *celebrate* his name;" and Isa. xii. 4, "Praise the Lord, *celebrate* his name, declare his doings," &c. From this readily follows the sense of *owning as a master, admitting the authority of, addressing in acknowledgment of his power*, which seems to be clearly found in Psa. xiv. 4, "Who eat up my people as they eat bread, and *call not* upon the Lord"—do not acknowledge him. Psa. lxxx. 18, "Quicken us and we will call upon thy name"—acknowledge ourselves thy servants. Jer. x. 25, "Pour out thy fury upon the Heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name"—that do not acknowledge thy authority—address thee as their Lord. Zeph. iii. 9, "For then will I change the language of the people to purity, that they may all *call upon the name* of the Lord"—acknowledge the authority of Jehovah—to serve him with one consent. This is the sense most applicable to Joel ii. 31, which is accommodated to his purpose by Peter, Acts ii. 21.

In all these examples, it is true that the phrase is applied to the Supreme God himself, but there is nothing in its nature which should prevent its equally proper application in such a case as that of our Lord; and as the occasions for the use of such a phrase could not be frequent, it is nothing wonderful that we do not meet with more varied examples. We conclude then confidently, that the periphrasis for Christians—"those who call on the name of the Lord," does not Imply the worship of Christ.

We proceed to the words of Stephen, upon which, however, we hardly need detain our readers. Ἐπικαλούμενον does not at all imply that he *called* in prayer; it is simply *called upon, entreated;* and the word *God* here introduced in our common Bibles, being printed in italics, is understood by all attentive readers to be introduced on the translator's own judgment, and to have no authority whatever. Let it be considered, then, how, in the first age, our Lord held constant communication with his church, ruling its affairs, and immediately directing the course and services of his principal disciples; let due account be taken of the vision of the glorified Jesus which the martyr had just before enjoyed, which was probably continued to him at the very time; and let the marked difference be observed between this address and the prayer immediately offered by Stephen to God himself, when *he fell on his knees* and said, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge;" and we think the entire futility of any argument founded on this passage for the religious worship of Christ, must be abundantly manifest.

Respecting the third of Dr. S.'s examples, the prayer of the apostles, Acts i. 24, but one remark can be needful—that most assuredly this prayer was addressed not to Christ, but to God himself, his Father and his God. Dr. S. states the matter thus:

"In the narrative of the proceedings of the eleven apostles, for supplying the vacancy in their number occasioned by the defection of Judas, we find that Peter, *after applying to Jesus, in an emphatical manner*, the epithet 'the

Lord,' *proceeded* to pray, 'Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts, shew whom thou hast chosen.'"—Script. Test. Vol. III. p. 52

Now, in fact, Peter, in his discourse, applied the epithet to him whom all his followers call their *Lord* in the accustomed manner, without any sign of peculiar emphasis, and it is related that after he had concluded, when, in consequence of his advice, two proper persons had been selected, Barnabas and Matthias, which selection must have occupied some time, "they," the assembled apostles, (it is not said, nor do we know, that Peter spoke for them,) "prayed and said, 'Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew which of these two thou hast chosen;'" using a title elsewhere given only to the All-seeing God the Father himself, and which, as there is evidently no ground in this passage, so there is none elsewhere, for applying to Christ. It is even observable that respectable orthodox writers do not generally press for this application. With a candour, courtesy, and kindness, which ought, for the sake of truth and justice, to be known and duly estimated, Dr. S. has called the natural and, we think, just remarks of some eminent Unitarian critics, that Stephen, witnessing the presence of Christ, and knowing that the government of the Church, in its first period, was immediately carried on by him, might entreat his aid in an awful moment, without praying to him as God, or sanctioning religious addresses to him, *a childish* and *imbecile subterfuge*. We neither choose to retort in any case such insulting and unwarrantable language, nor do we believe Dr. S. capable of using a subterfuge; but we do think that, if influenced by no higher motive, he ought at least to have been more cautious respecting the character of his own arguments, than he has shewn himself in the instance we have just been noticing, before he ventured to make such reflections on those of others.

There remains one other passage, Acts xiv. 23, "Having prayed, with fasting, they commended them, the disciples, to the Lord on whom they had believed." This is thought by Dr. S. to imply religious address to Christ. Let it only be observed that Paul and Barnabas prayed first as a distinct thing from commending the churches to the Lord, and that as the word *commend* means to commit to the care and direction of another, if Christ exercised controul and government over the churches, which is stated in Scripture to have been the fact, nothing could be more proper than, in taking leave, to wish that they might be under his special care, and if he is elsewhere plainly stated to have exercised this controul by the appointment, and in fulfilling the will of God his Father, then commending to his care, cannot imply making him God, or worshiping him as such. We have now gone through Dr. S.'s proofs that the book of Acts represents the first Christians as paying religious worship to the Lord Jesus Christ, and offered to the judgment of our readers what we hope they will esteem sufficient reasons for resisting his conclusion.

We must, in the next place, take a specimen from the chapter on the testimony of the Apostle John. The elaborate dissertation on the introduction to the gospel we must not touch, because we cannot now occupy the space necessary for doing any thing like justice to the subject. After all that has been written upon it, much may probably yet remain to reward farther investigation. We acknowledge that there is difficulty, but we sincerely think that the difficulty presses harder, on the whole, upon the orthodox than the Unitarian methods of interpretation, and we feel no doubt as to the general tendency of the passage.

But we turn at present to our author's remarks on a text in the 1st Epistle of John v. 20 : " And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true : and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." On the reference of the demonstrative pronoun *this*, in the last clause, to its nearest possible antecedent, Jesus Christ, a favourite argument for his deity is constructed. Our author commences by stating that the interpretation of the words " is attended with considerable difficulty." He, however, decides with sufficient confidence in favour of orthodoxy.

We follow, without feeling that we have much ground for hesitation, the interpretation usually given by Unitarians, and supported as being the most natural and suitable construction by not a few writers of unquestioned *orthodoxy* of sentiments. On the first part we adopt the paraphrase of Dr. Bloomfield, who leaves the application of the pronoun in the last clause doubtful, but clearly admitting the possibility and propriety of referring it to the Father. " We, moreover, assuredly know that the Son of God (the Messiah) is come, and hath given us this understanding that we may know him that is true (i. e. the true God, and the most acceptable way of obeying and worshiping him). And, indeed, we are *in union with* the true God, by means of his Son Jesus Christ." As to the remaining clause, since the reference of the pronoun to the more remote antecedent is acknowledged by all to be allowable *when necessary to the sense*, and since our blessed Lord himself, as recorded by the very apostle who writes this letter, addressed his Father as " the ONLY true God," consequently, cannot himself be here so called without the most direct contradiction, we hardly need seek any better authority for the only construction which frees us from the contradiction. Dr. S. objects to the translation, " We are in (ἐν) the true God, *by* or *through* (ἐν) his Son Jesus Christ." He cannot say it is inadmissible, but he likes the other best, and he thinks it " harsh to suppose that a change" (of the sense of ἐν) " was intended in so close and continuous a clause." In truth, it hardly is a *change* of sense : it is a slight modification of the same sense required by the connexion, which we happen to express in English by a different word. Dr. Bloomfield says, " The ἐν in ἐν τῷ υἱῷ is by most rendered *in*, as in the former clause. But the best commentators, from Grotius to Rosenmüller, assign to it the sense *per* (through). And so Tyndal. Certainly this sense is more apt : and Benson has shewn from several examples that ἐν may have two significations in the same sentence."

The expression *eternal life* is much relied upon as always belonging to Jesus Christ. But Christ is spoken of as the communicator and establisher of the doctrine of eternal life, not as the original author of the blessing. Let Rom. vi. 23, be recollected—*eternal life* is " the *gift of God* through Jesus Christ ;" and in John xvii. 3, which the author probably had in his mind when he wrote the words we are now examining, *eternal life* is said to consist in *knowing the only true God* and Jesus Christ whom he had sent. What more natural, then, than for the apostle, after glorying in the knowledge of the true God obtained through his Son, to exclaim, " This is the true God, and eternal life"—the Author and Source of that eternal life, which is made known to us by his Son ! It may now be sufficiently apparent that the argument for the deity of Christ from this text might as well have been abandoned by our author, as it has been by some of the most learned and respectable supporters of the doctrine.

In the chapter on the " Testimonies of the Apostles Peter, Jude, and James," all the most important arguments are derived from the rule respecting the use of the Greek article, to which public attention was first called by Mr. Granville Sharpe, and which has been corrected, explained, and illustrated, by the late Bishop Middleton.

Dr. S. employs very triumphant language on this subject, but it is astonishing that he and others should venture on such slight grounds to assume so confident a tone. Mr. Granville Sharp applied to his purpose what he observed to be a general fact, without very well understanding the nature of the phenomenon, or noting the exceptions with sufficient nicety. Dr. Middleton exhibited the rule as resulting from the true nature, origin, and purpose of the Greek article, and pointed out its limitations and exceptions, accounting for them with great skill and general success; but his previously fixed theological opinions did not allow him to perceive that the texts to which the rule is applied in the New Testament may be so considered as to fall within his own exceptions, which are quite as certain and well established as the rule itself.

If, indeed, it were not so, we should still remain unconvinced, because a few clear examples have been brought forward of deviation from the general rule which cannot be accounted for upon any known principle. Such irregularities are most likely to be found in works written in a foreign dialect. Even the learned Philo Judæus is accused of not having in all respects understood the proper use of the article, and it is much more probable, that there should be found in such works as the writings of the New Testament departures from the niceties of Greek construction than from self-contradictions, and assertions which, judging from what they have elsewhere said, the authors must have considered as impious. Such would be the state of our feelings if we could do no more than to point to the *unexplained* exceptions to the rule referred to; but our case is a much stronger one. Our position is, that the very principles of exception laid down and illustrated by Dr. Middleton, will be found capable of being applied with the strictest propriety to the passages which are the subjects of this inquiry.

It might, perhaps, be fairly said, that, explaining the general principles both of the rule and its exceptions, his statements in effect leave the particular cases to be determined by custom and authority; but we will not insist on this point. We shall give the rule in his own words, detail its acknowledged limitations and exceptions, explain its application to the class of passages in question, and shew on what grounds that application may be denied.

The rule is, " When two or more Attributives, joined by a Copulative or Copulatives, are *assumed* of the *same* person or thing, before the first Attributive the Article is *inserted;* before the remaining ones it is *omitted;*" of which it is taken for granted that the converse must be equally true: that *whenever* the article is *inserted* before the first attributive, and *omitted* before the remaining ones, they all belong to the *same* person or thing. But exceptions are made for names of substances, considered as substances, *proper names,* and names of abstract ideas: also for all such attributives, both singular and plural, as *by their nature cannot be predicated of the same subject without the most evident and direct contradiction.* Dr. Middleton is content with stating that, in this latter case, the perspicuity of the passage does not require the rule to be accurately observed; we think it, however, scarcely doubtful that the omission of the second article marks

some common relation of the objects, qualities, or persons, to the subject in hand. Certainly it can never shew those persons, things, or ideas, to be identical which are *notoriously distinct*, and this admission is all we require. Examples of the application of the rule in theological controversy are the following: Eph. v. 5, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ ΤΟΥ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ—"In the kingdom of Christ and of God:" common translation. "In the kingdom of *him who is* Christ and God:" translation contended for by Middleton, &c. Titus ii. 13, ΤΟΥ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—"Of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:" common translation, which is usually understood to make God and Christ distinct. "Of Jesus Christ our great God and Saviour:" translation according to the rule. 2 Thess. i. 12, κατὰ τὴν χάριν ΤΟΥ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—"According to the grace of our God, and the Lord Jesus Christ:" common translation. "According to the grace of our God and Lord Jesus Christ:" translation according to the rule, the application of which, however, in this case, Dr. Middleton considers as doubtful.

It will be seen that the construction contended for, in the first example, makes *being anointed* and *being God* two attributes of one person, to whom the kingdom belongs. But it must be noted that *Christ* is very frequently used in Scripture (as it is familiarly by us) as a proper name of him who was pre-eminently God's *anointed*. Dr. Middleton has very properly limited his exception for names of substances to the case *when considered as substances*, and pointed out that such names are not unfrequently used to mark, not the object itself, but *some quality which it eminently possesses*, in which case they are properly attributives and come within the rule. He should have stated also that words which are, strictly speaking, attributives, when frequently applied to an individual person or object, eminently possessing the attribute, may become truly of the nature of names of substances and proper names, and so may be *excluded from the operation of the rule*. We judge this to be the case with Χριστος (Christ) here, and when joined to the name Jesus, it is as to the construction a part of the proper name. It is also true that Θεος (God) without or with the article—God absolutely, or *He who is the God*, i. e. the only true God, is continually used in Scripture as *the name* of the Supreme Being, and, so employed, is to all intents and purposes a *proper name*. The translation, therefore, "in the kingdom of Christ and of God," may be justified on the same principle as that of the words ἡν ὤμοσε Κυριος ΤΩ Ἀβρααμ καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰακωβ, "which the Lord swore to Abraham, and to Isaac, and to Jacob," making them three persons, not one; and this translation is supported not only by the distinction constantly marked in Scripture between God and Christ, but by the unambiguous parallel expression, Rev. xii. 10, "The kingdom of our God, and the dominion of his Christ," both names of the same state of things, but marking the relation of that state to two distinct beings—the great Ruler of all things, and him whom he had appointed. It remains for us to ascertain whether the principle here maintained is applicable to the other cases. They are distinguished from that we have examined by the word *God* (which in them comes first) being accompanied by an adjective or pronoun, (2 Pet. i. 1,) and the word Christ being joined to Jesus and having *before* it either Κυριε (Lord) or Σωτηρος (Saviour). The construction contended for as required by the rule makes the being *the great God* or *our God*, and being *our Lord* or *our Saviour*, attributes of the one person Jesus Christ; but either of the attributives *Lord* and *Saviour* being very frequently applied to Christ, and pre-eminently above all beings, God himself excepted,

both of them being in fact *recognized titles* of Christ, the connected words "Lord Jesus Christ," or "our Saviour Jesus Christ," may form together *one personal appellation* or proper name, and the "Great God," or "our God," being incapable of designating any being but one, is likewise of the nature of a proper name, and thus the rule is inapplicable in these cases. No doubt the construction which makes *God* and *Saviour* or *Lord* both attributes of Jesus Christ, is allowable *as a construction*, but if Jesus was generally spoken of at the time as "the Lord Jesus Christ," or "our Saviour Jesus Christ," and his being entirely distinct from God was universally and without hesitation acknowledged, so that no ambiguity could arise, which is what we maintain on the authority of the general tenor of Scripture, and of numerous distinct testimonies; then it is evident that Dr. Middleton's exception for *proper* i. e. *personal names* and *other cases where the subjects of the attributes could not be confounded*, exactly applies to the texts under consideration; so that the question as to the *possibility* of the proposed new translation is to be settled by considerations arising, not out of the words of these texts *taken by themselves*, but out of the study of other parts of Scripture. Such expressions as follow where there is no ambiguity in the construction, and where the terms "God the Father," or "our Father," and "the Lord Jesus Christ," or "Jesus Christ our Saviour," are manifestly *complex personal appellations*, render it, we fearlessly say, *certain* that the corresponding terms must be so considered in the disputed texts, and shew the impossibility of their having been misunderstood or deemed ambiguous in the purest age of the church: "Favour be to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. i. 2. "Favour, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour," Titus i. 4. "Favour and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus who is our Lord," 2 Pet. i. 2, immediately following one of the contested texts, which it therefore may be taken as explaining. Here the name Lord being *specially attributed to* Jesus, not used as a known and established title, is placed *after*, with its own article; but this passage is a clear example of *God* having the nature of a *proper name*, and it shews the Being intended by that term (not here characterized as *the Father* only, but including the whole of what the term expresses) to be distinct from Jesus. Dr. S. speaks as if the Unitarians rested their defence in this part of the controversy entirely on the occurrence of unexplained exceptions to the rule, and he says, "Dr. Middleton contends that all the exceptions are such in appearance only, and may be accounted for on principles, not assumed to serve the purpose, but rational and necessary." On the contrary, Dr. Middleton has himself produced a remarkable exception to the rule which he acknowledges he cannot account for, (nor has he accounted for all those produced by others,) and the Unitarians contend that the disputed texts, properly considered, come within his own exceptions from the rule, and therefore exhibit no irregularity when translated in the usual manner. In reference to Dr. S.'s last paragraph on this subject, (Vol. III. p. 207,) we repeat that the difference between the expressions ΤΟΥ Θεῦ ἡμῶν και κυρίε Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ and ΤΟΥ κυρίε ἡμῶν και σωτῆρος Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ is, that Θεῦ being a *personal appellative* is not in this instance an *assumable attributive*. His being called *our* God, does not recognize any others as true gods, but marks our sense of our relationship to him. He is still God pre-eminently, *the* God recognized as having no equal, and therefore *Lord* is at once understood as a title forming part of the name of Jesus Christ, as 2 Cor. i. 2;

Titus i. 4, &c. On the contrary, in the second sentence, but one word which can be the name of a person occurring, the other words *must* be taken as attributes here specially ascribed to that person, and this appears to us to be perfectly consistent with the much-boasted rule, as explained and properly limited by Dr. Middleton, though not with that learned writer's own application of it.*

No doubt, one who thinks we have *elsewhere* sufficient proof of the deity of Christ, may with propriety adopt the proposed translations, but it is equally certain that one who believes that elsewhere God and Christ are always distinguished, may with equal propriety resist them, and consequently no independent argument in favour of the orthodox doctrine can be derived from the passages.

We now come to the testimony of the Apostle Paul. Dr. S. begins with a common rhetorical artifice. He calls our attention to all the enmity against the Apostle of the Gentiles, which has existed in ancient or in modern times, from the opposition of the first Judaizers down to the "Not Paul but Jesus" of Gamaliel Smith, and, without taking the slightest notice of the very obvious circumstances which account for both the one and the other—Jewish bigotry in the one case; horror of the unnatural system of Calvinism, commonly reputed to be especially contained in the writings of Paul, in the other—by a quiet assumption of the very thing which he undertakes to prove, he offers to explain the whole. Paul, according to his account, was "the *chosen vessel* of the Divine Spirit for completing the archives of Christian doctrine, by a clear and bold, a copious and uncompromising testimony to the *Divine person* and the redemption of Christ, the reign of his *grace*, and the conformity of its subjects to his *holiness*." Those who cannot, after the most patient investigation, see any thing of the testimony here referred to, but who can readily account for the enmity which has existed against the apostle, without at all recurring to it, have a double objection to Dr. S.'s statement, as being neither *true*, nor even apparently *required* for the explanation of the facts, which are detailed and commented upon in a declamatory style, fitted to excite or foster prejudices, and most unlike that of a calm inquirer after truth. A large portion of what Dr. S. has been pleased to call the testimony of this apostle "concerning the *Person* of the Redeemer and Saviour of men," does not really

---

* In Jude i. 5, the word God being a gloss and rejected from the text, we are in this dilemma: either the term δεσποτης "sovereign," was, as some think, peculiarly and exclusively applied by the Jews of our Lord's time to the Deity, or it was not: if it was, that peculiar use, by altogether forbidding its application to a person recognized as distinct from Deity or to any other than *the one being*, made it a personal appellation, and the text comes under the exception; if it was not, then Jesus Christ might with the most perfect propriety be called our only Sovereign and Lord, meaning to exclude all other pretenders to divine commission and consequent authority over us in God's name, and the rule is applied, but does not prove the Deity of Christ. Of course this argument assumes the decision of the question, respecting which no Unitarian feels any doubt, whether God and Christ are plainly and uniformly spoken of in Scripture as two distinct beings, but our object is to shew that no independent proof of the Deity of Christ can be drawn from the use of the article. In this passage of Jude, on either supposition, but especially on the latter, religious obedience is, as Dr. S. observes, required to Christ, "thus verifying his own word, that *all may honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*," in its only admissible interpretation—honouring the Son because they wish to honour the Father, because in honouring the Son they do best honour his Father who sent him. Vide Mon. Repos. Vol. I. New Series, p. 60.

relate to his *person* at all, but to the blessings of his religion, and, in a controversial point of view, can be nothing to our author's purpose, inasmuch as it presents no difficulty whatever on the Unitarian scheme;—thus the first article states, that "the Lord Jesus Christ is constantly celebrated, either by the mention of him alone, or in conjunction with the Divine Father, as the *author* and *bestower* of the greatest possible blessings, the supreme good of everlasting possession and enjoyment." What is here said is in the main true, and is acknowledged and felt to be so as much by Unitarians as by any other class of professing Christians.

Of the blessings of the gospel we cannot think too highly, and Jesus Christ is constantly celebrated as the communicator, in a very proper sense of the term, the *bestower* of these blessings. Taking, indeed, the word *author* strictly as meaning *the original source*, it cannot be applied to Christ; but every reader surely must observe that not one of the texts quoted justifies such an application, whilst the words of the same Apostle afford the strongest and clearest evidence against it: "Christ Jesus, who OF GOD is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption," 1 Cor. i. 30. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, WHO hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus," Eph. i. 3. "GOD, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved,) and hath raised us up together and made us to sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come HE *might shew the exceeding riches* of HIS *grace, in* HIS *kindness towards us*, through Christ Jesus." Who will pretend to reconcile these plain and positive declarations with the doctrine that Jesus was the *author* of gospel blessings? Let Dr. S.'s testimonies to "*parity* of power and influence with the Almighty Father" (which are no more than the conjunction of the name of Jesus with that of God in respect to the communication of those spiritual blessings which are elsewhere said to be given *through* him) be compared with these, and what doubt can there be as to the result? It is, indeed, strange that the following passages could be thought to afford proof of parity of power, even if that doctrine were not excluded by express declarations to the contrary—yet they are all which it has been thought expedient to produce: "Grace and peace be unto you, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ!" Rom. i. 7. "Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour!" Tit. i. 4. "Our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and our God and Father, (who hath loved us and hath given everlasting consolation and good hope by grace,) comfort your hearts and establish you in every good word and work!" 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. All that can be inferred from these passages is, that God and Christ are two beings, from both of whom something is to be expected respecting the desired gifts. He who believes what is elsewhere abundantly declared, knows that from God all blessings proceed, and that *through* Christ the inestimable blessings of the gospel were communicated, in the first age at least, by his express intermediation. To him, therefore, these passages present no difficulty; and he wonders at those who infer any thing from the distinction between the author and communicator of the gift, so often clearly marked, and naturally so little subject to doubt, not being repeated every time the blessing is thankfully celebrated or earnestly desired.

We must here notice a most uncandid and unjust reflection on Mr.

Belsham, introduced in connexion with the article we have been examining:

"Mr. B," says Dr. S, "does indeed, (i. e. in his work on the Epistles,) as his plan necessarily required, give his interpretation of the passages which have been above quoted. He adopts various methods of *altering their meaning* or *evading* their application." (This, reader, is said of a man of known and tried integrity, respecting a work which professes to expound to the best of his judgment the *true meaning* of the Apostle, and in which he was bound by the most solemn obligations of public duty and of personal fidelity to the Master whom he professed to serve, to introduce nothing which he did not conscientiously believe would conduce to that object! But such accusations are easily made, and by the majority of Dr S.'s readers will be readily believed, without much inquiry, as to their foundation.) "In one place, he (Mr. B.) takes into his text a different reading, upon evidence which Griesbach did not think amounted to even his lowest degree of probability, and which Heinrichs, Knapp, and Vater, have not thought worthy of noticing:" viz. as stated in a note, Col. iii. 13, "*The Lord* freely forgave you," instead of *Christ*.

Now, it is intended here to insinuate that Mr. Belsham made this alteration to serve a controversial purpose, whereas it is evident that no material point is gained by the change, and that Mr. B. could not have felt at all embarrassed by the reading of the received text. It is declared (Eph. iv. 32), that "God, *through Christ*, hath forgiven us." Whether, therefore, God or Christ, at the suggestion of the context, is named as affording us forgiveness, we know what is meant. But Mr. B. exercises his own judgment freely. He does not profess to follow Griesbach's text; he sometimes (and we regret it, as an incautious and unjustifiable course) even adopts conjectures which have recommended themselves to his own mind. In the present instance, he takes up as more suitable in his opinion to the context, and as being, to the best of his judgment, most probably what the Apostle wrote, a reading which certainly is in the situation which Dr. S. describes; but the inattention of even celebrated critics is no proof that a reading deserves neglect. The authorities followed by Mr. Belsham are the Alexandrian MS., which in the epistles exhibits pretty purely the Alexandrine recension of the sacred text, the Clermont, Augian, and Boernerian—all remarkable copies of the Western recension, with one other MS., and the Latin versions. Κυριε was then an *ancient Western* reading, not completely excluded from early copies containing the Alexandrine text. Griesbach probably thought that it was introduced to avoid something unusual, and that might be offensive in the expression "Christ forgave us;" and from comparison of the passage with Eph. iv. 32, or in consequence of the compound reading, "the God of Christ," found in the Armenian version, and "God in Christ," used by Augustine, in a seeming quotation of the words. But is not Mr. Belsham right, as a critic, in judging that χριστε was more likely to arise as an interpretation of κυριε, than the contrary change, which would be to substitute the indefinite for the clear; that the compound readings only shew the authors to have been acquainted both with "Lord" interpreted of God, and "Christ," and rather create a presumption that the word Christ, coming after, had been taken in from the margin? To the discussion, however, we attach little importance: what *is* important, is, that Mr. B. has been wantonly and without even a plausible pretence, charged with *wilfully corrupting* the text of Scripture. Yet Dr. S. has expressed himself so well on the duties of candour towards

opponents, and of maintaining a Christian spirit in controversy, that, sincerely believing these passages to represent the genuine sentiments and feelings of his mind when uninfluenced by peculiar prejudices, we cannot but hope that he will, on reflection, regret and be anxious to recall charges which are equally injurious and unfounded.

The 7th article of this chapter relates to the *name of Jesus*, from which we make the following extract:

"Here a very important passage may be considered, which not only gives information on the honour proper to the name of Christ, but comprehends *a full view* of a subject which has an intimate relation to our inquiry, the MEDIATORIAL KINGDOM of Christ. 'Wherefore also God hath highly exalted him, and hath bestowed upon him THE NAME which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee may bow, of heavenly and earthly and infernal beings; and that every tongue may confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord, unto the glory of God the Father.' . . . The *object* or thing bestowed, is the transcendant exaltation, the NAME of dignity and authority *above every created name*. This object appears to comprehend several important particulars: and the termination of the period of the Messiah's humbled condition . . . ii. The renewed manifestation of his Divine Perfections and Majesty to holy intelligences: the NAME *which is above every name*. iii. The acknowledgment, on the part of the intelligent universe, celestial and human, in the present state, and in the state of the dead, of his supremacy and authority . . . iv. In the respect which this exaltation has to the human nature, faculties, and enjoyments of the Messiah, it probably includes the following as principal circumstances: (1) His resurrection from the dead. (2) His being locally translated to . . . *heaven* . . . (3) The possession of the highest perfection, natural and moral, of which created existence is susceptible. (4) The especial and unparalleled dignity, happiness, and delight, resulting to the human nature, in all its capacities and feelings, from its conjunction with the Divine Nature of Christ; a union immortal, unique, and intimate, beyong all created capacity to conceive. v. The possession of a peculiar KINGDOM OR REIGN."—Script. Test. Vol. III. pp. 250—253.

Now all this is little better than pure fancy; and it is a most characteristic specimen of that unjustifiable refinement on the words of Scripture, by grafting upon them our own thoughts and opinions, for which Dr. S. is remarkable as a commentator. It cannot be needful for us to point out how many distinct particulars have nothing at all answering to them in the text, but in opposition to such strange perversion, it may be useful for us to explain what we take to be the full, real, and simple meaning of the Apostle. "Wherefore," i. e. as the *reward* of his humility and voluntary submission to suffering, "also GOD *hath highly exalted him*, and bestowed upon him that name * which is above every name." *Name* here stands for *title, dignity*, like the corresponding word in Hebrew and Latin: examples of the usage are given by Wetstein, Schleusner, and others. "That *at* the name of Jesus every knee may bow." Dr. S., like Mr. Belsham, after Secker, translates ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησου, "in the name of Jesus," of which version we think Mr. Belsham's note expresses the true sense: "that men should be taught by Jesus the worship

* Το ὄνομα το, κ. τ. λ. "*that* name," which we here adopt from Griesbach, *may be* the true reading, though supported only by Alexandrine authorities, and, perhaps, just the sort of verbal nicety to have originated in that recension. It does not, however, alter the sense of the passage.

of the true God:" but surely ἐν, answering to the Hebrew ב, here signifies *at*, and the intention is not literally to require the act specified, the performance of which in these times is absurd, if not idolatrous, but to express the authority of Jesus over his church, by the mention of a usual sign among oriental nations, of supreme authority, namely, bending the knee as an act of homage on the name being proclaimed. (Vid. Bloomfield, Rec. Syn. in loc.) "Of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth;" or better with Mr. B., according to the generally-acknowledged sense, "of those who are in heaven, and upon the earth, and under the earth," understood by most modern commentators "of angels, of men now living, and of departed men;" more probably, perhaps, signifying "in whatever state they may hitherto have been with respect to religious privileges and knowledge." "And that every tongue may confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." These last words teach plainly enough that whilst Christ was to be honoured and acknowledged as a Prince and a Saviour, he was not to be thought of as equal with God his Father, by whom his dignity was conferred, and whose glory was displayed in his elevation. In reading the whole passage, we find it so strongly expressing those opinions which we receive as scriptural and true—that the exaltation of Christ is derived from the Father's power, and acknowledged to his glory—as to be led to inquire with some curiosity how it could happen to be quoted in support of opposite doctrines, and the result of our reflection on the subject leads us to notice a very common fallacy which we must attribute to Dr. S. He never appears to us to make it his consideration, whether a text *necessarily implies* or *directly teaches* a certain doctrine; but, *supposing the truth* of the doctrine, how it will apply to the text. He sets out with a general conviction that his views are scriptural, and then applies as certain truths to the interpretation of *each* passage what he supposes that he has found in a number of others, though when distinct assertions are required, he is unable to produce them. His general convictions, which *may* not—for he is, like all men, liable to prejudice—have been originally derived from the study of the Scriptures, but from education and the influences of those around him, constitute *the chief reason* for the application he makes of each text, and suggest those strained and fanciful philological criticisms, and those developments of the supposed sense of a passage in which so many matters are introduced, unconnected with the words, that we wonder whence they were obtained, or why they were placed where they stand rather than any where else, which characterize his work. On the contrary, the true method of scriptural investigation appears to be, as we read the successive portions of the Sacred Volume, to observe what each book and each remarkable passage teaches, *considered in itself alone*, or with reference only to other *plainer* uses of the same phraseology, or expressions of the same thoughts, and having thus arrived at a general conclusion, to interpret the ambiguous or difficult passages in conformity with those which are liable to no misapprehension. Had Dr. S. pursued this method, he would hardly, we presume to think, either have thought so much to be derived from many passages he has quoted, or, in what professes to be a collection of *all* the testimonies of Scripture respecting the person of Christ, have omitted so many of those which are most intelligible and most decisive.

Conscious as we are of having already exceeded the limits which convenience would prescribe for this paper, we must say a few words on Dr.

S.'s mode of treating that celebrated text, considered as "the principal passage in Paul's Epistles which treats on the Deity of Christ,"* (Rom. ix. 5,) and which certainly appears to be valued in proportion to the rarity of such a supposed testimony by all the defenders of the doctrine. Dr. S. has taken due pains to guard against the supposition of the word *God* not being genuine, as well as against the conjectural emendation of Slichtingius and Taylor, which we lament to see adopted by Mr. Belsham, of ὢν ὁ instead of ὁ ὢν. Thus far he has our entire concurrence, as well as that, we suppose, of nearly the whole body of Unitarians in the present day. The question is, whether the words in the text, as they now stand, clearly and unambiguously express or teach the doctrine of the deity of Christ. The Unitarians contend that the words *may* indeed be so explained without *grammatical* impropriety, but that they may *as well* be explained differently, and that no early Christian could have thought of so taking them as to make them express this doctrine. It is, and *it must be* to serve their purpose, insisted on the other side that the words will properly admit of no other construction than that which makes them expressive of the doctrine. We shall spend no time in considering the plan adopted by Mr. Locke, of placing the point after παντων, because, though he may have shewn his accustomed sagacity in discovering the Apostle's general meaning in the passage, it is now pretty well agreed that the construction he supposes would not be a good one; and the other being esteemed most plausible by our adversaries, we may, with perfect fairness, confine our attention to it.

We translate the words then—"Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ, as it respects the flesh," i. e. as to his descent. "God who is over all be blessed for ever. Amen." To this it is objected by Dr. S., first, that "it is an evasion to serve a purpose; for every Greek scholar must admit that the fair and just construction of the sentence is that which is generally received." We admit nothing of the kind. Many of those whose opinion we adopt are usually esteemed Greek scholars, and Wetstein's quotations seem to prove, beyond contradiction, that in the earliest times our construction was generally followed. That the Fathers afterwards, with the growing corruption of the Church, came to patronise the construction now generally received, is nothing to the purpose, since we do not deny it to be grammatically good, nor do we doubt the disposition of those Fathers to find or make evidence for the deity of Christ; but the numerous testimonies against Christ having ever been called in scripture "God over all," shew how the words were understood by those whose authority is most valuable. *Secondly*, it is objected that our construction "is contrary to grammatical propriety, for ὁ ὢν *must* refer to the *foregoing* noun as the subject, while that which follows is the predicate; except in cases in which there is no preceding nominative, but the article contains the predicate and becomes in effect a pronoun. To render the construction tenable, the form of the sentence must have been considerably different;" either, it is added in a note, Ὁ δε Θεος ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων εὐλογητὸς εἰς τους αἰῶνας or Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεος ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, εἰς τους αἰῶνας, whereas the present words are Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεος εὐλογητὸς εἰς τους αἰῶνας. It is supposed, then, that another article is required, that Θεος ought to be be placed before ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, and that the ὁ ὢν coming as it does first, must necessarily refer to the nominative in the preceding clause; and, lastly, that εὐλογητὸς ought, on

* Michaelis, Anmerkungen., apud Smith, Script. Test. Vol. III. p. 377.

our supposition, to come first in the sentence. To prove that another article is not required, (which indeed Dr. Middleton does not contend for, only suggesting as the *more probable* expression of the sense we contend for, εὐλογητὸς ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεος εἰς τους αἰῶνας,) we quote from Philo, p. 860, Ed. 1640, (apud Middleton,) του προς ἀληθειαν ὀντος Θεου· Clem. Rom. ad Cor. Cap. xxxii. ὁ παντοκρατωρ Θεος. The first is a case precisely in point; and in the second, παντοκρατωρ is equivalent with ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων. No doubt *if* θεος *had been placed first*, it would have had a separate article, and the clause would have resembled, for instance, that of the Epistle of Barnabas, Ὁ Θεος ὁ παντος του κοσμου κυριευων, δωῃ ὑμιν, κ. τ. λ.; but there is no ground whatever for asserting that such an arrangement is *necessary* to give the sense, or would be on any account preferable in the present instance. Again, that ὁ ὢν must refer to a nominative in the preceding sentence, whenever there is one, is altogether an arbitrary assertion, and a rule made for the occasion. When it is at the beginning of a sentence, it refers of course to a nominative following, of which there are many examples in the New Testament. The question is whether, in the example before us, it does begin a sentence or not, which would in general be very easily determined by the connexion, as we think that it may be in this instance. Lastly, before it is asserted that εὐλογητὸς must stand first for the proper expression of what we take to be the sense of the passage, let it be considered that there is one clear example in the LXX., Ps. lxviii. 19, (which Dr. S. vainly endeavours to set aside by an unfounded attack on the text,) of εὐλογητὸς coming last in a doxology, and that in all the instances in the Old Testament there is but one in which εἰς τον αἰῶνα is appended to εὐλογητὸς, and there only ὁ Θεος comes between them. On the other hand, in the New Testament, the words εὐλογητὸς εἰς τους αἰῶνας occur three times, *always immediately following one another;* and if they had been here separated, it must have been not by one, but several words, which would have been a harsh construction; there appears, therefore, to be a sufficient reason for the somewhat unusual position of εὐλογητὸς on our construction, and it cannot be affirmed that it violates any rule. Middleton, indeed, puts the objection to it very modestly; but Dr. S., in copying him, has not thought it necessary to observe the same caution. We would add here, that ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων being a recognized title of the "Supreme God," expressly appropriated by the early Christian writers to *the Father*, the grammatical ambiguity would cause no doubt in any mind as to the true sense, until after the structure of modern orthodoxy had been nearly completed by a corrupt age. Mr. Yates justly appeals to the remarkable imitation of the passage, by Clem. Rom. ad Cor. Cap. xxxii., where even the words "from him, (meaning Jacob,) as concerning the flesh, (τὸ κατὰ σάρκα,) came the Lord Jesus," are found, but where the doxology is omitted as having no connexion with the other part, a decisive proof how the text was understood in a very early age, since it is hardly conceivable that Clement should not have added the final clause, or something to the same purpose, if he had thought it applicable to Christ.

But farther, and finally, Dr. S. "conceives that there is reason in the observation that the clause, *as it respects the flesh*, is one part of an antithesis, the other member of which is to be sought in the sequel of the paragraph." There is truly a sort of antithesis, but the other member is here, as in ver. 3 of the same chapter, to be sought in the Apostle's mind, and in the minds of his readers. He speaks of "his kinsmen according to the flesh" in contrast with his spiritual relationship to all Christians. He describes the Lord Jesus

as descended from the Israelites, "according to the flesh," in contrast with his appointment to be *the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness*, or holy spirit. See Rom. i. 3, 4, and the Monthly Repos. New Series, Vol. IV. pp. 661—664.

We are now obliged to bring this critique to a conclusion. It is our hope that our remarks are calculated to assist the honest inquirer in justly estimating a work which is esteemed one of the bulwarks of orthodoxy. Dr. S. himself we regard with respect, both on account of the learning and ability he has displayed, and of the spirit which he often manifests. For all, and it is not a little, which he has said kindly, liberally, and as became a Christian, of our body and our supposed errors, we sincerely thank him; and if, when we have met with uncandid reflections, with unfounded and injurious accusations, we have presumed to hold the language of rebuke, we have done so not in anger against him, but in justice to our fellow-believers and our friends, in defence of what we are fully convinced is Christian truth and the grand means for the promotion of human happiness, which we hope will appear to him and to others a sufficient apology.

ERRATUM.

Page 88, line 37, the first word, for "and" read *or*.

CATALOGUE OF BOOKS

Distributed by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association in the Year 1832, at their Office, No. 3, Walbrook Buildings, Walbrook, London.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, in an Improved Version, upon the Basis of Archbishop Newcome's New Translation, with a corrected Text, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. The fourth edition, corrected to Griesbach's last Text, with additional Notes. Super Royal 8vo. 1*l.* 5*s.*

The Same. Demy 12mo., with the Introduction and the Critical and Explanatory Notes, but omitting the Various Readings. 7*s.*

ASPLAND'S (Rev. R.) Sermon on the Power of Truth. 1*s.*

A New Way of Deciding Old Controversies. By BASANISTES. 8vo. 5*s.*

BELSHAM'S (Rev. THOMAS) Translation and Exposition of Paul's Epistles. 4 Vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 5*s.*

——————— Sermon on the Death of the Rev. T. Lindsey. 4*d.*

——————— The Bampton Lecturer Reproved. 8vo. Boards. 6*s.*

——————— Sermon on the Act to relieve Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity. 6*d.*

——————— Essay on the Character and Writings of. 8vo. 2*s.*

CARPENTER'S (Dr.) Unitarians' Appeal, with the Texts. 1*d.*

Catechism of the Unitarian Churches of Poland: to which is prefixed a History of Unitarianism on the Continent. By THOMAS REES, LL.D. F.S.A. 12mo. Boards. 5*s.*

CHANNING'S (Dr. W. E.) Sermon preached before the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Council, and Legislature of Massachusetts at the Annual Election, May 26, 1830. 1*s.*

CLARK'S Answer to the Question, "Why are you a Christian?" 4*d.*

COGAN'S (Dr.) Letters to W. Wilberforce, Esq., on the Doctrine of Hereditary Depravity. 2*s.*

DE LUC'S (JEAN ANDRE) Examen de la Doctrine des Ecritures touchant la Personne de Jésus Christ. 8*s.*

DISNEY'S Sermons. Vols. III. and IV. Boards. 10*s.*

——— Three Tracts in Vindication of the Worship of One God. 1*s.* 6*d.*

DRUMMOND'S (Rev. Dr.) Discourse—"Reason the Handmaid of Religion" (delivered before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 1829). 1*s.*

——————— Letters to Archbishop Magee—"Unitarianism no feeble and conceited Heresy." 1*s.* 6*d.*

Elton *versus* Elton; or Mr. Elton's Second Thoughts answered by his First. (Extracted from the Christian Reformer.) 1*s.*

EMLYN'S (Rev. THOMAS) Narrative of his Sufferings at Dublin for his Writings against the Trinity. 1*s.*

FARMER'S Dissertation on Miracles. 4*s.* 6*d.*

——————— on the Demoniacs of the New Testament. 3*s.* 6*d.*

——————— on the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation. 2*s.*

From the Author
with his regards

ON THE

ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENT

OF

INDIA:

WITH FURTHER REMARKS

ON THE PRACTICABILITY OF

ABOLISHING SUTTEES.

Second Edition.

THE

INEFFICIENCY

OF THE

ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENT

OF

INDIA

CONSIDERED, IN REFERENCE TO THE

Expediency of Appointing a Second Bishop.

WITH

FURTHER REMARKS

ON

THE PRACTICABILITY OF

Abolishing Suttees.

BY THE REV. DR. SHEPHERD.

Est profecto Deus, qui quæ nos gerimus viditque audetque.

PLAUTUS.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY.

1829.

Printed by A. Hancock, Middle Row Place, Holborn.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE duties of a Bishop of India, it may be said, are altogether of an apostolical nature; and require as much bodily as mental exertion. These duties have in some measure been misconceived, and in the same proportion the labour has been exaggerated. People have been misled by the geographical magnitude of his diocese, and have forgotten that his jurisdiction is incomparably less intricate than that of a Bishop in this country. In India there are no relations of Incumbent and Curate to call for the Bishop's attention—no questions touching siminiacal presentations—no strifes with parishes about repairs of Churches or of Chancels, &c. It is true that Bishop Middleton in his zeal to have Churches, had to contend with difficulties of no ordinary kind, arising from the reluctance of the Local Government to advance money for Ecclesiastical purposes without the authority of the Court; and, if we are to credit what we read, Churches are still wanted at stations to which Chaplains at this moment stand appointed. Contemplating then the deficiency of Protestant Churches in India, and reflecting on the EXERTIONS which have been made for the propagation of the Gospel in that country, it must appear somewhat extraordinary that a WORK of such vital importance, as the building Churches at all those stations to which Chaplains stand appointed, should

have been so long disregarded. Early in 1822, in some printed Suggestions, I pressed the expediency of increasing the number of Chaplains, and the necessity of building Churches; and what, in reference to the latter, I advanced on that occasion, will no less hold good on the present. The evil consequences arising from a deficiency of Churches must operate in retarding, if not in altogether obstructing the success of those exertions. And there is but too much reason for apprehending that the mischief does not stop here. It must eventually reach the Christian Community: it must very materially, and may most seriously, affect their spiritual welfare. This is the more to be dreaded from the consideration,—that, while man is man, Religion like man must have a body and a soul. It must be external as well as internal; and the two parts in both cases will ever have a mutual influence upon each other. It is observable that the Senses and the Imagination must have a considerable share in Public Worship; and Devotion will accordingly be depressed by the mean and dispiriting, or elevated by the respectable and cheerful appearance of the objects around us. This observation though common, is not the less forcible. It is a truism, which must be generally acknowledged; and particularly felt by those who attend DivineWorship in a Mess-Bungalow, or in the Dormitory of a Soldier's Barrack.

It may be advanced that God has been served, and may be served acceptably, without any Church.—He MAY undoubtedly be served acceptably without a Church, when it is not in our power to have one. But when we are daily expending large sums in our public buildings,—when we have expended so much in the erection of a College, and in rendering it elegant as well as convenient; and when an Undertaking of such magnitude, has been effected by a successful appeal to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and by the aid of voluntary con-

tributions:—Surely no less zeal should stimulate our efforts to obtain similar assistance, wherewithal we may be enabled to erect a House of God at *each* of those stations where a Chaplain resides, and the Sacred Edifice is wanting—Surely we should not grudge an expenditure which would make the hallowed Structure neat and decent—which would render it in every respect SUCH as Christians may with a pleasurable satisfaction frequent; and SUCH as becomes the Government of our Eastern Possessions.

It may not be irrelevant to remark that there have been for many years, and are at this time in the Danish, French, and Dutch Settlements, Churches in proportion to the number of their population, that there are in various parts of the Country, Armenian and Roman Catholic Churches, particularly the latter, and that there is scarcely a village to be seen without an Edifice erected to the Deity under some form or other,—while at our Stations, even where there are resident Clergy, the want of Churches is still observable.

In reference to the actual expense of building Churches in India, of which I possess something more than mere speculative knowledge, I am induced to express a belief that the sum of £60,000 would be more than would be required for the erecting a number sufficient to meet the present exigency in the three Presidencies. BUT I have to observe that in advancing this I advert more particularly to that part of the country under the Bengal Government, as OF IT I can speak under a conviction formed from long local Experience. When stationed at Futtyghur in 1804 I was enabled by the aid of a voluntary contribution, the result of an appeal to the resident Europeans at that place, to establish a Church or Chapel. The original purchase of the premises, and the necessary alterations in the building, cost about 4,500 sicca Rupees, or within £600.

Shortly after the capture of the Mauritius, while acting colonial Chaplain, I also under the authority of the local Government established the *present* Protestant Church in that Island; the expense of which amounted to about 1,200 liv. st. or £1,100.*

On my return to Calcutta, I was appointed Junior Presidency Chaplain by the late Earl Minto; and on my appointment as Ordinary to the Jail by the late most noble the Marquis of Hastings, I built by order of Government a Chapel capable of containing from 150 to 200 persons; the total disbursement attending which did not exceed 10,000 Sicca Rupees, or £1,200.

In reverting to the expediency of erecting Churches, I have to notice, that as the Stations differ in the number of residents, so must the churches differ in size; and consequently it would be difficult to ascertain correctly the expense of each, as that must vary according to the scale of the building. But if the Court were to advance 30,000 to enable the Bishop on his arrival to commence the glorious undertaking, by sending an authority to such effect to their several local Governments, much delay would be saved, and an excitement given to the cause which would experience the warmest and most earnest support of many of the opulent in this country, as well as of India.—That such an undertaking as the building of Churches would meet the approbation, support, and encouragement of all individuals of wealth connected with India I am assured; nor can I evince the correctness of this assumption better than by stating that all the Churches now existing in and out of Calcutta, the present Cathedral not ex-

* To account for the smallness of this sum it should be stated that Government gave up a very large edifice which was built for a magazine, but which, during the war was converted into a prison for our seamen and soldiers, and which contained some hundreds.—It was in such good order and built of such excellent materials, that little was wanting besides the arrangment in the interior to make it respectable.

cepted, were built by the beneficent aid of a liberal Community, and in some instances solely by their voluntary contributions.

In my observations respecting the prevailing neglect in securing to the British Soldiery the services of Religion, I have not written in such strong terms as past circumstances and present omissions would have fully justified me in doing: And in all that I have in the subsequent pages advanced on that head, as well as in respect to supersession and other matters connected with our Eastern Church, I have been guided by a wish to place in the clearest point of view those still existing evils, which call aloud for a full inquiry, so that they may be remedied; and also that the Clergy may be rescued from that state of humiliation to which they are at present subjected, and which is as unmerited as it is unwise, and, if the propagation of the Gospel be a *desideratum*, as impolitic as it is to the Ministers of *that Gospel* cruel and unjust.

Since the Postscript has been committed to the press, I have through the kindness of a gentleman been favoured with the perusal of some pamphlets in reference to the abolition of Suttees: In one of which the author adverts to my suggestion relative to the interference of the Local Government by the proposed edict in page 68; and he expresses his conviction "*that this measure would, doubtless, save many widows, but would not annihilate the cruel custom.*"* But can it with reason be expected, that any legislative enactment, or any promulgated law of prohibition, would INSTANTER annihilate a national custom, however cruel and revolting to the common feelings of humanity, when that custom has been established by a crafty priesthood for ages past—foisted into their religious code—and interwoven with the fictions of their fabulous religion? Be it also remembered, that the more false any religion is, the more industrious the priests of

* A Voice from India (page 13) by the Rev. J. Peggs.

it are, particularly when their own views and interests are concerned, to keep the people from prying into the mysteries of it; and hence the more difficult it is to counteract the effects of the artifice employed by that priesthood to render such a people the more zealous and confident in their ignorance. With this view of the subject, I never advanced that the proposed edict would have an immediate effect in *annihilating the cruel custom;* but if it would tend to *save life,* which I firmly believe it would, it merits attention, and demands the experiment. It is a much better mode than that of prohibiting* the sale of such articles in the bazaars as are required for the Suttee, or than that of resorting to strong measures to prevent crowds congregating on such occasions, as being a much safer mode of proceeding, and less calculated to excite irritation in the minds of the natives. What may at particular times have been successfully accomplished at the Presidency of Madras or Bombay, might fail at that of Bengal; for very different are the notions, as well as the habits of the natives of the three Presidencies: And however ardent I am for the abolition of Suttees, I should view any forcible attempt to disperse the vast concourse of natives assembled round the fatal pile with a fearful apprehension, lest the cause of humanity might suffer; inasmuch as that by such efforts to save one life, a hundred might be lost—for it is impossible for any man to pronounce to what pitch of extravagance the enthusiasm of a deluded mob might lead, or where the excited fury of disappointed zealots might terminate.

In the month of February, 1827, I ventured to enclose to the late Archbishop of Canterbury a Copy of a Letter transmitted by me to the Board of Control, in which I presumed to recommend the appointing a second Bishop to our Islands and Possessions eastward of the Cape, as

* Vide page 13 of "A Voice from India."

a measure better calculated to do extensive and real good, than that of having three Bishops SOLELY for the Peninsula of India. I then stated to his Grace, that I had been led to suggest the expediency of *the measure* in consequence of a Paragraph that had appeared in a Morning Print; and which, as referred to in the course of my observations, I here subjoin,* and shall now hasten to the immediate object I have in view, viz.: to offer TO THOSE INTERESTED IN THE PROMOTION AND PROPAGATION OF OUR RELIGIOUS FAITH, the subsequent remarks; some of which in reference to undue supercession have, with other matter, appeared in a printed correspondence with the late Bishop Heber. My reason for continuing the remarks in the same order, in which they first appeared, is assigned in the postscript; and as they will be found to be supported by what has been advanced by the present Bishop of London, it may the more readily be collected and powerfully exhibited, how far a revisal in some of the East India Company's Regulations, and a reform in some parts

* "The leading Members of one, or both of the Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel at home and abroad, have, it is said, held, or are about to hold, a Meeting to take into consideration the steps necessary to be adopted in consequence of the death of the late Bishop of CALCUTTA; and the object they have in view, is reported to be, the establishment of three Bishopricks in India, instead of one. That it is the duty of every Christian Church, and indeed, of every denomination of Christians, to extend the truths and practices of the Gospel by every legitimate means, cannot be denied; and though it may be doubted whether the means taken to do so among the natives of our vast empire in India have been altogether such as wisdom and prudence would suggest, there can at any rate be no doubt but that it is the paramount duty of the mother country to afford to the immense number of its own subjects now settled in India, as well as to the half-caste natives, every facility for the exercise and encouragement of religious duties. As to the best means of accomplishing this, of course much diversity of opinion will naturally exist. For our own parts, with every respect for the Mother Church, we doubt very much whether the extension of the Episcopal office in India is precisely that description of religious want which calls for the earliest supply—we should rather be inclined to suggest a larger supply of inferior Clergy, in the nature of Parish Priests, to be much more desirable."—*Morning Herald, Dec. 8th*, 1826.

of their Clerical Establishment, might be both wisely and prudently adopted.

I am well aware that Revisals and Reforms are looked on generally with no favourable eye, when suggested by such an humble individual as myself; but a revisal of any Regulation pregnant with mischief, and a reform in any Establishment calculated to do good, merit some consideration, however insignificant the suggester may be esteemed: And, although I have seen many of my former suggestions carried into effect, and others enjoy the fruits of my labours, I am still anxious to be the humble means of serving that Cause, in which during the far better part of my life I have been zealously, and, if the testimony received by me from the local Government of India can afford a satisfactory and conclusive proof, *usefully* engaged. In expressing a hope that, whatever may be the result of my present efforts in the cause of Religion and of humanity, my honest intentions and unreserved communications may not be misconstrued, I cannot offer a better apology for this my presumption, than that my object has been, and now is, to perform that obligation which the Bishop of London has forcibly declared to be "a moral one of the strongest "kind;—an obligation laid upon every Christian to "promote the good of souls, and to second the merciful "designs of God in the redemption of mankind; an "obligation binding upon the conscience, and power-"fully constraining the heart of every one, who knows "the value of the Gift, which he himself has freely "received; and rising in sacredness and strictness *ac-*"*cording to the closeness of his connexion* with those "who are ignorant and out of the way."

H. S.

Langley, Colnbrook.

CURSORY REMARKS, &c.

It is now about fifteen years since the Legislature acknowledged the force of the several Appeals for the formation of an Episcopal Establishment for British India; wherefore on the last renewal of the Charter a Bishop was appointed. But, strange and unaccountable as the omission must appear, neither in the words of the Charter, nor of his Lordship's Patent, was "a further provision for "the spiritual nurture and steadfastness of those "who were already believers," even noticed: Neither our Colonies, nor our other Possessions in that distant part of the world, throughout which our countrymen are so numerously distributed, were taken into account: And hence an acceptable service may perhaps be done to them in submitting their present neglected state to public notice. It might be, that the Bishop of Chester alluded to this very omission when, in his Sermon preached before the Societies for Promoting and Propagating Christian

Knowledge, his Lordship put the following query; —"Has either part of the obligation, incumbent on "a Christian country been adequately fulfilled; the "providing for the spiritual nurture and steadfast- "ness of those who are already believers, or the "bringing of the Heathen into the fold of Christ?"

The doubt, as expressed by a public print, in regard to "whether the means taken to extend the "Truths and practices of the Gospel among the "Natives of our vast empire in India, have been "altogether such as wisdom and prudence would "suggest,"* is left for others to determine. But to its being "the paramount duty of the mother "country to afford to the immense number of its "own subjects now settled in India, as well as "to the half-caste natives, every facility for the "exercise and encouragement of religious du- "ties," every real Christian must heartily subscribe. And, as the most legitimate and safe means that can by us be adopted "for the bringing of the "Heathen into the fold of Christ," must be the nurture and steadfastness of those who are already in the faith, a firm persuasion may be unreservedly expressed, that the success of our labours, in respect to the Propagation of the Gospel in all our foreign possessions, depends on the attention directed by Government towards the religious interests of our own countrymen, respectively inhabiting *those foreign possessions;* and that by *so* directing their attention, they will not only adopt the MOST LEGI-

* See Extract, page 7.

TIMATE, but the SAFEST means, by which the conversion of the natives can, under the blessing of Divine Providence, be effected.

The Rev. Dr. Buchannan in his Memoir observes, "that no establishment for the instruction of Hindoos, however expensive, however becoming our "national character, or obligatory on our principles, can possibly be organised to efficient purpose without the aid of a local church. Let us "first establish our own religion amongst *ourselves*, and our Asiatic subjects will soon benefit "by it." The same author in his Christian's Researches, asserts that "an attempt had been made "to divert the attention from the true object, and "instead of considering it as an Establishment for "Christians, to set it forth as an Establishment for "instructing the Hindoos." He then proceeds to observe, that "An Ecclesiastical Establishment "would yet be necessary for British India, if *there* "*were not a Mahometan or Hindoo in the land.* "For besides the thousands of British Christians "who live and die in that country, there are hundreds of thousands of native Christians, who are "at this moment as sheep without a shepherd; and "who are not insensible to their destitute state, "but supplicate our countenance and protection. "Surely the measure cannot be contemplated by "the legislature for a moment, without perceiving "its absolute propriety, on the common principles "of justice and humanity."

Dr. Buchannan's zeal for an Episcopal Establishment in the East, urged him to suggest the expediency of appointing a metropolitan Archbishop, and three suffragan Bishops, &c. &c. But near two years previously to such his suggestion, viz. in 1805-6, a plan for Church Government in India had been proposed on a much more moderate and limited scale; and under, at that time, a prevailing supposition, that all our foreign possessions were in Church matters controled by the Bishop of London, as being attached to his Lordship's diocese, the proposed measure was submitted to Bishop Porteus, who expressing his own approval *advised* its being submitted to his Grace of Canterbury for further consideration; and which was accordingly done.

The measure proposed was, the appointment of a Vicar-General or Bishop, with three Archdeacons. The latter were to have been the three Senior Chaplains at the three Presidencies, who, having risen from the junior situations, and served at the several stations of their respective Presidencies, would have been enabled to assist the Bishop with every local information relative to the rules and regulations of the service,—the manners and customs of the country in regard to the Europeans,—the habits and prejudices of the natives,—the stations, as to their locality and importance in respect to the number of Christians,—and indeed as to the various other matters of which a Bishop in India should necessarily be in possession. The Archdeacons were to

receive 500*l.* per annum in addition to their salary as Senior Presidency Chaplains. Here, at the very outset, was a saving of 4,500*l.* per annum, as each Archdeacon now receives 2,000*l.* per annum:—and thus there would already have been a saving of nearly 70,000*l.*, whilst the Establishment would have been much more efficient than that now formed.

The Bishop was not to have been considered as stationary or fixed to either Presidency; but to be a truly Asiatic Bishop, extending his visitations to the interior, as well as to the Presidencies. He was to have spent his first year in personally visiting each station on the Bengal Establishment,—in consecrating such churches as might be built in the interior of the country,—in holding confirmations at the head stations of every district, &c.—and in issuing such regulations for the furtherance of religion as from his own local knowledge he might deem expedient. (Considering the extent of country, and the number of stations where his presence is actually required, together with the arrangements he would have to make, it would take him the year in a proper fulfilment of his duties.)—He was afterwards to have proceeded to Madras, and to have spent the greater part of the second year on that Establishment in a similar performance of his episcopal functions. On the third year, after visiting Bombay and its interior, he was to have returned to Bengal; and thus was he to have made his triennial visitations of Stations as well as of Presidencies.

It may be recollected, that when India was first erected into a See, the Island of Ceylon formed no part of the Diocese of Calcutta: The expediency of making it a part of that Diocese originated with the late Bishop Middleton, who in his third visitation deemed it expedient to include Penang. Thus, much of the valuable time which that Prelate would have been enabled to have given to visiting the interior of his Diocese was engrossed by sea voyages. A similar encroachment on the time of the late Bishop Heber is to be lamented; and, consequently, how to prevent its recurrence merits consideration.

The Bishop of Chester, in his Discourse already adverted to, observed, that "the duty incumbent "on a Christian Government, of providing for "the religious instruction of its Christian sub-"jects, is a duty which cannot be denied, how-"ever the acknowledgment of it may be evaded." The force, therefore, of his Lordship's observation must be acknowledged to be such as to warrant a suggestion on the expediency of appointing a second Bishop; should the object which the Societies for the propagation of the Gospel at home and abroad have in view, viz. the "establishment of "three Bishopricks instead of one," be for the present postponed. Indeed such a measure may be opposed and rejected on the ground of increasing expense without meeting other and perhaps still stronger claims to the beneficent consideration of the Board and the Government, than those within

the limits of the three Presidencies: For it may justly be advanced, that if our Ecclesiastical Establishment be of any use—if Episcopacy be necessary or essential any where, some such form of Discipline, and such an Order as that of Bishops, are surely wanted to superintend the Protestant Church in our Islands no less than on the Continent of India: And as we are assured by the voice of Truth, that whatever good we can do should be more especially done to the Household of Faith, the appointment of a second Bishop to the eastward of the Cape, appears to be a measure so truly desirable as hardly to be resisted.

By the appointment of a *second* Bishop, whose episcopal functions should be directed to the Colonies and Islands eastward of the Cape, the future Bishop of Calcutta would be empowered to confine his duties to the Continent of India; and not like his regretted Predecessors, for the favourable accomplishment of a sea voyage, have to hasten through the interior of his extensive Diocese, in order to take advantage of the different monsoons which prevail in the Eastern Seas.

Under a supposition that a *second* Bishop should ultimately become appointed, and consequently his attention be directed to our Colonies or Possessions in that distant quarter, the following is the course with the several places of stoppage, which he could, with advantage to the best interests of religion, most conveniently to himself take in his visitation. And as his residence, if

Bengal, Madras, and Bombay form the Diocese of Calcutta, would be nominally or ostensibly at the *Cape,* his visitation is considered to commence from *that* point.

Leaving the Cape, it would be desirable for him first to visit the Mauritius, which may be considered in point of distance from twenty to thirty days' sail: From thence he would go to Ceylon, a passage of about three weeks—From Ceylon he would cross the Bay of Bengal, and reach Penang in about twelve or fifteen days—On quitting Penang he would sail through the straits of Malacca, and touch at Singapore in his way to Canton, a voyage from sixteen to twenty days—On his departure from Canton he might visit Melville Island, another of our settlements, and from thence through Torre's Straits to York Point, coasting New South Wales to Port Jackson; this voyage would occupy about three weeks—From Port Jackson to Van Dieman's Land would be a passage of about ten days—And sailing from thence to St. Helena, which may be considered the best course in his return to the Cape, he would finish his visitation in about three weeks more.

But if the two Presidencies of Calcutta and Madras should, on deliberation, be deemed of sufficient magnitude for one Diocese, *Bombay* might form a component part of the second Bishoprick. And, as the latter Presidency is in the track of several China ships, as also the principal Port of the Company's marine, the Bishop *from it*

would always have the best opportunities of making his visitations, and at the most moderate expense: and for which a fixed allowance might be made, in order to prevent any unreasonable charges.

If Bombay were a part of the second Diocese, the Bishop could visit the interior of this Presidency every other year, and the only difference in the route of his more extended visitation by sea would be in his sailing *first* to Ceylon, and returning by the Mauritius to Bombay, which in this case would be his Lordship's ostensible residence instead of the Cape. In the course thus pointed out the Bishop would be enabled to take his passage in such ships as might in their times of sailing offer most convenient accommodation—And, as in the order of Ports already laid down there are always ships to be met with, it would be unnecessary to take up or engage any particular vessel for the whole visitation; which cannot but be desirable, as saving a vast expense, and making the Bishop master of his own time.

An objection to the foregoing measure may arise from an apparent incongruity in uniting the Government Colonies and a part of the East India Company's Possessions under *one* Bishop, and hence as to the mode of payment of his Lordship's salary and pension. But be it recollected, that at this moment two Government Colonies, viz. Ceylon and New South Wales, are annexed to the See of Calcutta, and therefore there can be no reason for allowing such

objection to have any weight: And as the Archdeaconries of Ceylon and New South Wales would be transferred to the Diocese of the second Bishop, the Government and the East India Company might readily adjust the payment of his Lordship's income by a comparative relation to the different places he would have to visit as being in his jurisdiction. That the *Duties* of the two Bishops would, as to their own individual ease and comfort, bear no comparison; and that the performance of *those*, which would indispensably be required of the second Bishop, would be attended with danger as well as many privations, must be evident; it follows then, that in point of income and retirement the second Bishop should be placed on an equal footing with the Bishop of Calcutta.

It may here be advanced (as indeed was the case when the Duty of the Bishop's visiting each station in his Diocese was enforced *on a former occasion*) that there are not many who would accept the situation of Bishop under such circumstances; and that still fewer, who have good preferment, would resign it to undertake such a visitation; or who, like Bishop Heber, "would deliberately and wil-"lingly sacrifice personal ease and comfort in the "discharge of duty."* But the unwillingness on the part of individuals to incur future Fatigue and Inconvenience, or to part with present Good, renders not the suggestion objectionable, nor the plan less

* Bishop of Chester's Discourse.

eligible. And as there is nothing in the chain of events, which does not imply a positive contradiction, that ought to be deemed unattainable till the practicability of it be tried and have failed, it surely would be advisable to make the experiment.

It has already been shewn that, by some such arrangement as the one proposed, the Bishop of Calcutta would be empowered to confine the whole of his time and attention to the two Presidencies of Bengal and Madras: And if a Dean be appointed to the Cathedral of Calcutta, with a jurisdiction over the Districts adjoining to *the Presidency*, and the Archdeacon's residence be transferred to Cawnpore, the Bishop would experience much relief and assistance in discharging his important duties throughout his extensive Diocese.

In the foregoing suggestion on the expediency of appointing a second Bishop to the eastward of the Cape, there is no indirect intention to impugn the advantage of having three Bishops to the three Presidencies, as stated in the paragraph* already referred to, to be *the object* of the meeting of the Societies for promoting and propagating Christian Knowledge; but it may be allowable to remark, and it is without meaning to offend the high Authorities in favour of a more enlarged Episcopacy, that unless the episcopal functions of those Bishops extend beyond the limits of the three Presidencies, 80,000 persons professing the Christian faith will

* See Par. page 7.

not participate in the benefits arising from an episcopal establishment: And when the population of New South Wales and its dependencies—when those of our other Colonies and Possessions, wherein our countrymen and their descendants are in such numbers distributed, come under contemplation, it will be found that far more than 80,000 individuals, *and who may surely be considered of the Household of Faith,* will still have cause to complain of that neglect which they have hitherto experienced—a neglect the more unaccountable, as undoubtedly our own countrymen and their progeny must have as strong a claim to the beneficent attention of Government, as can possibly be urged on behalf of the native of India.

Ceylon and New South Wales having been formed into Archdeaconries since British India was first erected into a See, there cannot be any barrier against a similar Church Establishment being given to the Cape; when the Mauritius and St. Helena, from their adjacent situations, might form a component part of that Archdeaconry. And, should it be recollected that there are at the Cape more than double the number of inhabitants professing Christianity than at Ceylon, should the numbers at the Mauritius and St. Helena be taken into the account, *it will be found* that the duties of such an extended Archdeaconry as that of the Cape and its Dependencies will bear no comparison with those of Ceylon; and that the Archidiaconal visitations to the

Mauritius and St. Helena by sea, and to the new settlement beyond Algoa Bay, would make the Archdeacon's appointment *no sinecure*. Yet such an appointment is nevertheless necessary and expedient, and would be of essential service to the interests of Religion, as giving a regular Church Establishment to these Colonies; and which Establishment by its zealous efforts, if properly directed, might contribute much to the furtherance of the Propagation of the Gospel in Madagascar. This latter object is worthy of some consideration if, as the Bishop of Chester observes, "the Government "of a Christian Country is not exonerated from the "duty of pursuing the grand object of evangeliza- "tion, *even beyond the limits of its territorial pos-* "*sessions*, whensoever Providence appears to call "for its exertions, by facilitating and prospering "its intercourse with heathen people."

The Propagation of the Gospel in Madagascar, as above remarked, can be effected by no better nor surer method than by establishing an intercourse of good fellowship with the natives; and in effecting which we have, from late circumstances and present appearances, every reason to hope and believe that our zealous efforts *if properly directed* will, under the blessing of Providence, be successful in the result: Indeed it may in the nature of sublunary events be expected, that the late visit of its native Princes to this country, as well as its vicinity and constant traffic with the Mauritius,

cannot but tend to hasten the completion of the *truly desirable undertaking*. With this view the learned Prelate's *foregoing observation* will fully justify a few Remarks on the method of increasing and consolidating the existing intercourse, *as the best means* by which, under the Divine assistance, the Gospel of Christ may in Madagascar be propagated and established; and to this end it will not be stepping out of our road if we first note the present distressed state of the Planter in the Mauritius.

The Planter's difficulties arise principally from not having sufficient hands to cultivate his estates, whereby he is induced to complain of the necessary taxes levied by the local Government,—when, as he observes, his means of payment are curtailed by the abolition of the Slave Trade: For the Island being both rocky and hilly, those instruments of labour which assist the agriculturist in England, are there in a manner useless: And as perhaps there are not more than one half of the number of working slaves in that Colony that there used to be, the labour of those who remain in servitude is necessarily increased; and this increases the runaways; so that many of the Habitations or Farms are not in a state of cultivation: and hence it may be readily inferred, that the want of manual labour renders nearly two-thirds of the Island in a manner unproductive. From these causes the Planter draws an unfavourable comparison between his own situ-

ation and that of the cultivator at Bourbon; in which Island the high local Authorities are not, perhaps, equally zealous, or so much on the alert in the cause of humanity, as our Government at the Mauritius; and hence arises the dissatisfaction which is so prevalent among the Planters of the latter Colony.

The runaway Slaves, from their scanty and precarious subsistence in the interior, as also from the dread and hazard of being retaken, might be induced to return to their occupations, were they not afraid of their former masters; who, they very naturally suppose, would severely punish them; and by additional labour and rigorous treatment, make them feel the full weight of their resentment, for the loss sustained by their absconding from service.—To obviate the difficulty of their return to society, as well as to assist the Agriculturist with hands, it might be expedient for the Government to proclaim *an amnesty to all runaway Slaves, now in the interior:* intimating, that all, who would take advantage of the proclamation or amnesty, should be considered as under the protection of the local Government, and treated in the same way as those taken on board ships employed in the Slave Trade. These latter, since that hateful traffic has been declared illicit, are protected and fostered by the Government, are clothed and fed from its stores, are employed or hired out under its authority, and thus are made

useful members of the community. And perhaps nothing would more tend to increase their general usefulness, than the establishment of an *English School,* where their Children at four years old might be taken care of, and instructed in the principles of religion, being on or before their admission into it *baptized into the Christian Faith.* At a proper age they might be apprenticed for not less than five years to any Planter, Trader, or Mechanic; at the expiration of such period they should have the privilege of engaging in service for not less than one year, or the option of returning to Madagascar by those opportunities, which almost daily offer.

By these means an intercourse would be established with the interior of that Island; and the prosperity of the Mauritius would be eventually increased. Nor is this prosperity the only good to be expected from the adoption of a system somewhat similar to the one proposed, as in a few years we may look for its beneficial effects extending beyond the pale of that our territorial possession: For when the younger part of the Slave Population, who may thus be trained up under the fostering hand of Government, baptized in the Christian faith, educated in its principles, and speaking the language of their benefactors, shall have grown into manhood, and re-visit their parent Country,—we shall *then* have ground on which to build a reasonable hope, that, under the dispensation of an all-gracious Providence, the light of the Gospel

may *not only* dawn on the Island of Madagascar, but that, in due time, Christianity may become the prevailing religion of the Country; and that by its beneficial effects on the human mind, the present race may be succeeded by a comparatively moral, an industrious, and a useful people.

From what has been advanced, as the same enlightened and truly Christian scheme might be no less beneficially extended to the hapless native of Africa, additional arguments present themselves in support of the proposed Clerical Establishment,—viz. the Cape, the Mauritius, and St. Helena, to be formed into *one Archdeaconry.*

But to return from this digression to the Church Establishment on the Continent of India, and *consider whether a larger supply of inferior Clergy, in the nature of Parish Priests, be much more desirable than an extension of the episcopal office.** The number of Chaplains in the Company's service, if effectively kept up according to the late increase, may be fairly considered as sufficient for the due performance of the several duties required of them: But as from the remoteness of India, a district remains long unsupplied with a Clergyman, on a vacancy occurring, by the Furlough, Resignation, or Death of the Chaplain or incumbent, the number cannot be regarded as *effectively kept up,* without six or eight extra Chaplains being in the country

* See Par. from the Morning Herald, page 7.

ready to officiate at any vacant district. For the future, therefore, the Chaplains should not be appointed as heretofore specifically to either Presidency, but to India generally, and placed at the disposal of the Bishop, who would thus be enabled to supply the place of a Chaplain who may be absent on sick-certificate or three years' furlough: And whenever a vacancy should occur by resignation or death, the Court should without delay send out to the Bishop another supernumerary Chaplain, *who* in his turn should succeed to a fixed appointment. Such an arrangement would not interfere with the actual patronage of the Court, and would in some measure obviate a most serious evil, for it has occurred that one-third of the Stations on the Bengal Establishment has been vacant at one time —an evil the present Regulations, in regard to Furlough, are more calculated to increase than to rectify. For a Chaplain in the Hon. Company's employ becomes entitled to a three years' furlough after an actual residence of seven years in India; and this without any restriction as to the number of Chaplains who may be present in the discharge of their official duties: so that out of thirty on the Establishment, twenty may at one time take advantage of the Regulation, and absent themselves from the cure of their respective districts or parishes. And, indeed, so far do the Regulations tend to increase the evil of such absenteeism, that if a Chaplain should remain abroad

in the zealous discharge of his duty for a period of twenty-one years, *without once availing himself of the allowed furlough,* and should by his conduct so far obtain the approbation of the Local Authorities as to be placed in the higher and more lucrative situations on the Establishment, he would be deprived of *every advantage* should ill health or family affairs compel him, after that long service, to take advantage of the furlough to which, fourteen years before, he was entitled—*for* under the present Regulations he would not be permitted by the Court to return to his rank and situation, but be reduced to the humiliating circumstance of being appointed on his return to India to an inferior situation in the service.

Thus, strange as it may appear, every inducement is held out to a Chaplain to avail himself of the authorized Furlough on the very instant he is entitled to it; no regard being paid as to *how,* or *by what means,* his place during a three years' absence is to be supplied. Under the *present Regulation* it would be cruel and unjust to the individual to oppose his leave of absence on that, or any other, ground; for self-preservation is the law of nature. And, if a man must, notwithstanding the most praiseworthy exertions in his vocation, be deprived of his rank and situation by the injurious effects of a Regulation, primarily enacted for his benefit, he cannot be blamed for making that Regulation so far subservient to his own views as to

avail himself of the only advantage which, in its changed form, it may hold out—viz. *the permission to visit his native country for three years after a period of seven years' service.* In so doing he would lose nothing by his return to India, as on his arrival he would be appointed to a station of equal emolument to that which he had relinquished; whereas it has been shewn that the old and zealous Minister would forfeit all the advantages of that station in the service, to which by a *long and unremitting discharge of duty* he had attained, should an impaired constitution, or the urgency of family affairs bring him to England *after treble the period* of service required by the Regulations. For HE would be reduced to the distressing alternative of retiring on a pension not adequate to his support, or of submitting to the mortification of being placed on his return to India in an inferior station in point of rank and emolument, and of seeing his *junior* in the service (who had in the early part of his ministry taken advantage of his furlough, and absented himself from duty for the allowed three years) in *possession* of that preferment, which imperious necessity had alone compelled him for a time to quit.

That the Regulation granting a Furlough to the Chaplains originated from a beneficent intention on the part of the Court of Directors cannot be doubted; and that it was intended by them not only as a restorative to a constitution that might

suffer from the baneful effects of an ungenial clime, but as a Reward for past services, and as an Incentive to future exertions, cannot be questioned. In order then to make the now-existing Regulations as to Furlough answerable to the benevolent design of the Court, without infringing on the primary privilege granted to the Chaplains, at the same time keeping in view the vital interests of Religion, as far as the residence of an officiating ministry can promote them—Chaplains should be entitled to the Furlough after a seven years' service, with the proviso, that only to one-sixth of the Clergy in each Establishment such privilege should at one time be granted—and that the claims of individuals to the indulgence should be regulated by seniority in the service. At the same time, as an inducement to the Clergy to remain in charge of their several Districts, it should be further enacted, that on their arrival from furlough within the authorized leave of absence, they should be permitted to return to the stations they had for such period left, if previously thereto licensed by the Bishop; and also, that their rank in the service, and their claims to stations of superior emolument, should not be affected by their temporary absence, but preserved to them in the same manner as rank and pay are guarranteed to all other absent servants, who in the East India Company are entitled to the privilege of Furlough. And to the end that there might be always a sufficient number of Clergy in

India to officiate at the vacant stations or districts, the expediency of having a certain number of supernumerary Chaplains in India, as has already been suggested, as also in what manner it would be advisable to have them appointed, must be apparent: For the increasing the Clergy on *each* Establishment, and the *multiplying* the districts in proportion to *such separate increase,* would not in a comparative estimate of expense, so readily as the plan proposed, counteract the evil consequences arising from stations or districts being for a long period left without an officiating minister.

If it be, as the Bishop of Chester asserts it to be, "a duty incumbent on those who aim at "promoting the substantial prosperity of Christ's "Church, to make, in the first instance, a due pro-"vision for such of its branches as are without the "appointed means of edification and grace; and "are consequently in danger of a gradual derelic-"tion, first, of the ordinances, then of the moral "duties, and, lastly, of the belief of Christianity," what will be said when it is affirmed, that since 1805-6 there has never been an officiating Minister with the King's soldiery in India, *when on active service in the field.*

If we look to the formation of our Armies, that have been employed in the Peninsula of Europe, we shall find that on every occasion a Chaplain was appointed to each Brigade, in addition to the

one at Head Quarters; whereas, NOT EVEN ONE Chaplain has ever marched with the British troops on the Peninsula of India. What possible excuse can then be offered for such flagrant inattention to His Majesty's explicit and positive commands, relative to the religious Instruction and comfort of the soldier, in whatever country, or on whatever duty he may be employed.

That such a gross neglect should have existed for so many years, and even during the period we have had a Prelacy established in the East, must excite astonishment. Indeed, it must almost appear incredible, that while we have been labouring to convert others to our Faith, we should have been so notoriously regardless of our own Household. That the cause of conversion in the East must have materially suffered by such a continued neglect cannot for a moment be doubted; for while the public services of our Church are manifestly neglected by us, when surrounded by our native brethren-in-arms, how can we as reasoning men expect to make converts to our religious persuasion? While we are regardless of those already in the Faith, such an expectation is not in accordance with common sense;—nor is it in accordance with the reasoning faculties of man.

It is a lamentable but *undeniable* fact, that since the conclusion of the late heroic Lord Lake's last campaign in 1804-5, there has never been *one*

Chaplain with any one of the numerous armies that have taken the field. The fact is of such a nature—so hostile to every just notion of religion—so contradictory to the feeling of the Country, and in such direct opposition to that part of the existing Law, *the Articles of War,* that the melancholy fact will scarcely appear credible.

The Bishop of Chester would certainly appear not to have been aware of the circumstance, when in his late Discourse his Lordship takes occasion to remark, "that the recent success of our arms to "the eastward of the great Peninsula, afford an "opportunity of making known the Truths of the "Gospel to a people, &c. &c." What will his Lordship say, when informed that with those several armies, by which *those successes* were obtained, there was not a single established Chaplain, nor even a solitary Missionary.

It may with surprise and earnestness be asked—Can this gross omission, this dereliction of a most responsible duty, have existed for upwards of one-and-twenty years? This total inattention to His Majesty's express orders, this contemptuous disobedience of the Articles of War respecting the due performance of religious duties when British soldiers take the field, have prevailed for such a lengthened period? The reply is in *the affirmative* and the assertion is *most unreserved.* And in order to confirm the truth of the sorrowful assertion, it

will be but to travel back to the siege and capture of Kemona in 1807, at which place his Majesty's troops were employed, and where, in conjunction with those of the Company, they severely suffered. Let it be enquired if a Chaplain were present on that occasion to administer religious consolation to the wounded and dying, or to pay the last sad office to the dead.—Not one! With his Majesty's troops at the storming of Callinger?—No! With his Majesty's troops at the conquest of Hattrass? —No! With his Majesty's troops at the capture of Kolunga?—No! With his Majesty's troops at any *one* period of the time when the armies were employed against Nepaul?—Not one! With his Majesty's forces against Java, or even during the several years we had possession of that Island and its dependencies?—Not one! Nor was there a *single* Chaplain with the 25 or 30,000 men lately employed against Bhurtpoor! It has already been observed that during the several campaigns against the Burmese, there has never been one Chaplain with *any one* army engaged in that war: And when the cholera morbus was spreading devastation in the camp of the late Marquis of Hastings— when hundreds were dying in a day, and the roads and camp were literally strewed with the dead— that revered and illustrious nobleman was deterred not only from appointing but accepting the proffered services of a Chaplain, from his Lordship's inability, on the part of the local Government, to

grant him any compensation, either *as* covering the extra heavy, and to him ruinous, expenses he would unavoidably be obliged to incur, or *as* a remuneration for services of no ordinary kind and on no ordinary occasion.

Such are the much-to-be-lamented consequences arising from the Court of Director's Orders dated 5th of June, 1805, and promulgated in India on the 15th of May, 1806.—How many thousands of our gallant Soldiery have expired from wounds and sickness without those consolations of Religion which our Church holds out! How many thousands of them have been committed to the earth without that last duty—that last tribute of respect being paid to their remains, which that Church enjoins! And how many thousands of our Sepoys have returned, after those several campaigns, to the cultivation of their fields, extolling in the bosoms of their families our prowess, our humanity, and our faith ;—*faith not towards God but towards man ;*—thus holding us up as patterns in heroism, and in every noble quality but one—RELIGION! In her service they have had too much reason to believe that we are very deficient, or very supine; and in either case, neither they, nor their families nor connections are, with such a feeling as that apparent deficiency or evident supineness must produce in their minds, likely to become converts to the Truths of the Gospel.

If we turn our eyes to the unwearied exertions of individuals in the furtherance of religious instruction to their necessitous brethren at home, this prevailing neglect of our countrymen abroad appears in still stronger colours; and not less unaccountable than to be deplored.

In the daily prints we often read the result of meetings whose professed object is *to bring our sailors to the true knowledge of the living God and their Saviour:* and however we may differ on certain points of doctrine and opinion with some of the promoters of such meetings, we can as Christians do no less than commend their efforts, and pray for their success. At one of these late meetings* the present Marquiss of Cholmondley took occasion to observe that "as a Churchman he felt it his duty to state "that he would not support the undertaking if its "object had been to gain proselytes from the esta-"blished Religion; but as its object was to pro-"mote the eternal welfare of Seamen, of whatever "Christian sect they might attach themselves to, "he considered it as deserving of the encourage-"ment of every man who wished well to his fellow "creatures."

How cordially must every true Christian join in such his Lordship's sentiments; and what a sad reflection do such meetings cast on any Government that neglects the best interests of their brave defenders, or tacitly permits their own orders on a

* Port of London, and Bethel Union Society.

point of such vital consequence to the Church Establishment, and through her to the Constitution, as the religious instruction of the British soldier, to be treated with a contemptuous neglect. —And if ever there was a subject that required a rigid investigation on the part of this Government—if ever there was a matter of importance to the State that demanded a Parliamentary enquiry—it is the contemptuous neglect which has for so many years been manifested in the non-observance of those Laws (for the Articles of War can be considered in no other light) which were enacted and still continue in force for the better securing to the British soldier the means of religious instruction and comfort, wherever he may be employed.

The Church Establishment and the Civil Constitution of the country are so dependent on each other, that if the one be subverted, the other amidst the awful catastrophe cannot remain uninjured nor stand secure. Upon an impartial view of this axiom, which has been frequently and amply discussed by men of abilities and learning, it may indeed be asserted that Church and State are so closely connected, so interwoven each with the other, that whatever blow may be aimed at the one will in its consequences, immediate or more remote, affect the other;—if the religious instruction and comfort of *the Soldier* be not duly attended to by those in power, there are those out of power who

will readily step in: hence, surely no member of our Church can be surprised at the increase of Dissenters in the ranks of our soldiery. If then their attachment to our Church be in a political point of view worth preserving—if *their* best interests in a religious one merit attention—surely that gross neglect which has hitherto prevailed imperiously calls for the interposition of the Legislature. And although it may not be requisite to direct the finger of accusation to any particular point, it is hoped that sufficient may have been adduced to insure the attention of those in power to the foregoing facts.

As it might here be expected that *some measure* be devised, whereby the *existing evil* may for the present be remedied, (and *which*, it is to be hoped, will be altogether removed by the enactment of further Regulations on the renewal of the Charter) the following suggestion is respectfully submitted to the consideration of the Governing Powers.

THAT THE FORMER REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE APPOINTMENT OF A CHAPLAIN BY THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF, AS ONE OF HIS OWN PERSONAL STAFF, BE RENEWED—THAT SUCH CHAPLAIN BE CONSIDERED UNDER THE SPECIAL ORDERS OF HIS EXCELLENCY—THAT HE BE AT ALL TIMES READY TO ACCOMPANY THE KING'S TROOPS ON ACTIVE SERVICE, BOTH WHEN HIS EXCELLENCY ASSUMES THE PERSONAL COMMAND ON THOSE OCCASIONS, OR IN HIS JUDGMENT THINKS FROM THE NUMBER OF EUROPEANS SO EM-

PLOYED THE SERVICES OF SUCH CHAPLAIN ARE EXPEDIENT—AND THAT THE EXTRA PAY AND ALLOWANCES AS DRAWN BY THE REV. DR. M'KINNON, WHEN WITH THE ARMY UNDER THE PERSONAL COMMAND OF THE LATE LORD LAKE, BE CONTINUED TILL SOME OTHER AND ADEQUATE PROVISION OR COMPENSATION FOR THE ARDUOUS DUTIES AND EXTRA HEAVY EXPENSE ATTENDANT ON THE SITUATION OF A CHAPLAIN GENERAL, OR THE *ONLY* CHAPLAIN TO AN INDIAN ARMY (for it must be recollected that a Chaplain for each brigade, as with our troops on the continent of Europe, is not procurable in India,) BE FINALLY ADJUSTED.

When the Court, in their Order of the 5th of June, 1805, abolished all extra allowances paid to Chaplains for extra duties, it may fairly be presumed, that they never took into consideration the probability or possibility of a Chaplain being in the execution of his duty, put to any extra and unavoidable expense. At Muttra there are two regiments, one of cavalry, the other of infantry; and the lines occupied by them are at a considerable distance from each other: The two regiments at Khanpore are similarly situated, being at the extremes of that extensive cantonment, and therefore, in visiting the hospitals, and in the ordinary execution of his duty, the Chaplain must incur additional expense; and also additional exposure and trouble to that which falls to the lot of Chaplains at those stations where there is not one, *or* more

than one, European regiment stationed. Why then should not the Pay and Batta, according to His Majesty's warrant bearing date Sept. 3, 1796, be enforced at all Stations where two or more than two of His Majesty's Regiments are cantoned? And this is the more reasonable when the Regulations, relative to extra Pay and Allowances, in favour of their Civil and Military Servants, are taken into consideration. Whenever a Civil Servant is sent on any extra duty he receives extra pay, under the title of Deputation Allowance, and whenever a Military Servant takes a Command, he is entitled to the Batta of a superior Rank, in consideration that from such Command he is liable to additional expenses. And as a datum to direct us in respect to the fair claim that every Chaplain has to some consideration, where there are two Regiments cantoned, the following Order is annexed,* in the earnest hope that *it* may meet the benevolent attention of those in authority, who will not forget that "the labourer is worthy of his "hire," and, that a Chaplain has often a wife and

* *General Order.* 20*th Feb.* 1800.—It having been represented to the Commander in Chief that the Rev. Mr. Clark has officiated as Chaplain to his Majesty's 33rd and 73rd regiments, the General is pleased to authorize his continuing to act in that capacity with those corps, and to draw the allowance of seven shillings per day as specified by his Majesty's Warrant of the 23rd of September, 1796, during the time he shall remain in and perform the duties of Chaplain to any two regiments stationed in the Garrison of Seringapatam.

family to look up to him as perhaps the only earthly Source from which they can obtain present support, or future provision.

It may here be not unaptly remarked, that an officer, when directed or appointed on any occasion to read prayers to the troops under the absurd designation of *Acting Chaplain,* has been allowed to draw the extra allowance, that *very* extra allowance for extra duty which has been refused to a regular Chaplain. Among the instances that may be produced, *one* will be sufficient for the present purpose. Was not Lieut. G. J. Hendy appointed by the late Sir Stamford Raffles to read prayers on certain occasions; and did he not draw the pay and batta of a regular Chaplain, as Acting Chaplain at that Station? That the necessity for adopting such a measure was unnecessary, will be best proved by the following undeniable circumstance: *The Author on reaching Calcutta, about two days after the departure of Earl Minto on the expedition to Batavia, and finding transports still in the river, waited on Colonel Carey, Sir G. Hewitt's Military Secretary, and tendered his services, expressing his readiness to embark with a detachment of Artillery, then preparing to join the armament proceeding to Java. The Colonel received his proffer with polite attention; but declined it, observing, that there was no provision made for a Chaplain, either to meet his expenses, or to remunerate him for his services;*

and added, that the whole of the tonnage was taken up by the officers and men, and that there was no part appropriated for a Military Chaplain.

It may here be enquired, whether a Prelate of our Church was then in the Country—Not at this time. But Bishop Middleton arrived soon after, and was in the Country while Lieut. Hendy was performing *the sacerdotal functions of a Priest:* And the only way to account for his Lordship's non-interference was his non-acquaintance with the fact: And such facts as the foregoing prove the expediency of giving the Bishop a seat in Council, so that his Lordship may personally attend whenever he has any thing to propose regarding the Church Establishment. The reasonableness, and indeed fitness of his Lordship's presence in support of such matters as he may deem proper to press upon the attention of Government relative to *Religion* must be unquestionable: but his Lordship's voice should of course be strictly confined to the concerns of the Church, and never raised excepting when questions affecting her Interests, or those of her Ministers, come under the cognizance or discussion of Council.

In advancing the propriety of his Lordship's having a seat in Council, under the foregoing restrictions, the Revisal of his Lordship's Rank must not be omitted. By the Letters Patent relative to the formation of the supreme Court of Judicature the Rank assigned to the Chief Justice in India *was specified to be the same as that of the Lord Chief*

Justice of the King's Bench in England. Now as in the Table of Precedence the Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench ranks considerably below the Prelates of our Church in this country, it is difficult to account for the Chief Justice of the supreme Court in either Presidency taking precedence of the Bishop of Calcutta. As it may, therefore, very reasonably be supposed that the present arrangement has arisen from an oversight, it should be corrected; for in no country is there a greater deference paid to Precedence than in India, nor is it less punctiliously observed by Europeans than by the Natives.

"The Fear," which has been expressed in reference to the appointment of Bishops to India, "that there must be a certain waste of valuable "life, as no European arriving in India *at the age* "which a Bishop has usually reached before he "obtains his appointment, is likely to preserve his "health long," * is without foundation. It is idle in the extreme—as the very reverse of such a notion may be readily drawn from the opinions of the Faculty, and satisfactorily confirmed by the results of experience.

In accordance to the general opinion of Medical Practitioners, it may be observed that from 30 to 45 years of age is the most dangerous era in a man's life for his arriving in India, and assuming a situation to which Duties of no ordinary kind are attached: At that period of life the constitution has

* See Quarterly Review, for April, 1827.

usually attained its highest degree of vigour; and during the whole of that period the susceptibility to existing causes of inflammatory disease is considerable even in this climate, but in that of India it is most remarkable. The individual, circumstanced as the Bishop would be under such an appointment, has moreover none of the advantages which a gradual introduction to active exertion secures to every other class of Europeans in the Honourable Company's service: He is suddenly, and without preparation, exposed to all the pernicious influences of great mental and bodily exertion, superadded to the common chances of disease belonging to the climate; and it is evident that these chances acting powerfully on a constitution already so predisposed to disease, will render the chance of escape exceedingly small. It is only those who have passed the period of life referred to, or those inured to the climate from early youth, who can expect what may be termed a fair chance of reaping the reward of the sacrifices they have made.

Every doubt as to the truth of the foregoing observation will vanish if we refer to a few of those individuals, who from their appointments to high stations have arrived in India in what is generally termed the decline of life. Who ever more closely applied to business in the closet, or more readily encountered the perils of a change of clime, than the indefatigable Earl Minto? Who ever underwent greater bodily or mental fatigue than the late Vis-

count Lake and the Marquiss of Hastings? Was the former at the advanced age of 60, ever known through infirmity, or any other cause, to shrink from the arduous duties of the field? Was he not, even at a more advanced age, always to be seen on his horse at the head of the cavalry, fording rivers and encountering difficulties and hardships with a spirit and vigour surpassed by no officer in the army? Did not the noble Marquiss, at a no less age, and with equal vigour, endure the fatigue incident to a harassing campaign, at a time when 12,000 of the army and its followers fell victims to disease? And who enjoyed better health, or who were more alive to every call on their corporeal and intellectual powers than those distinguished Characters? If we turn our eyes to the illustrious Marquiss Wellesley, or the Nobleman who is now at the head of the local Government, we shall find that they have been no less alert on every occasion that required great and unwearied exertion; and that *they* did not arrive in India t ll *they* had passed what may be termed their climacteric. How futile then must be the notion as to the *required age* for the efficient discharge of the duties of a Bishop in India; and more especially so when it is presumed that the duties of the latter can bear no comparison in point of mental and bodily fatigue with those of the illustrious and distinguished characters already named. But the futility of the notion is not that which deserves consideration—as, if on any future

occasion it should be acted upon, the natives may not be so readily induced to treat the head of our Church with that veneration which his high office enjoins, or with that serious and respectful attention which the sanctity of age commands: For although we have amongst ourselves laid aside that respect for those advanced in years, which our forefathers observed, the Native still retains it in all its pristine purity;—and therefore it is the more necessary that the position, on which *the fear* is grounded, should be fairly met and plainly confuted, in order to prevent the evil consequences that might possibly arise from such a fear having its influence in a future nomination to the See of Calcutta.

The next subject for enquiry which presents itself to notice, is what may be the best and safest method to be employed in the Propagation of our Faith throughout our Eastern Possessions.

The Journalist to whom a reference has already been made, has expressed his doubts as to "whether "the means taken to extend the truths and prac- "tices of the Gospel among the natives of our vast "empire in India, have been altogether such as "wisdom and prudence would suggest;" and in speaking further on this subject, he observes that "it is the paramount duty of the mother country to "afford to the immense number of its own subjects "now settled in India, as well as to the half-caste

" natives, every facility for the exercise and en-
" couragement of Religious duties." The Bishop of Chester has made a similar declaration—and also doubts whether " either part of the obliga-
" tion on a Christian country has been acceptably
" fulfilled—the providing for the spiritual nurture
" and steadfastness of those who are already Be-
" lievers, or the bringing of the Heathen into the
" fold of Christ."

It has already been shewn that a great and sad neglect has for years existed in respect to our countrymen in India, *to those who are already believers,* —and that, consequently, there could not possibly be any just ground for entertaining a reasonable expectation of bringing the Heathen into the fold of Christ. The best and safest method now to be recommended, if we would induce them to quit the error of their ways, is no longer to remain in that of ours; but to let our attention be directed to those means which may best tend to demonstrate that we have A CHURCH WE VENERATE, AND A CLERGY WE RESPECT.

The means, which would be pointed out by any discriminating mind, *possessed of local knowledge,* would be those, which would place the character of our Church on the highest ground; and none would so materially tend to that desired end AS A DUE AND PROPER ATTENTION TO ITS ORDINANCES, IN WHATEVER PART OF THE COUNTRY WE ARE ENGAGED; AND THAT RESPECTFUL COURTESY IN PUBLIC SOCIETY, WHICH THE DIGNITY OF THEIR OFFICE INDISPENSABLY

REQUIRES, AND ON WHICH THE ULTIMATE SUCCESS OF THEIR LABOURS SO MATERIALLY DEPENDS.

Towards the attainment of this great object there might be adopted one very simple arrangement, which, in its result, would prove of greater importance than at first view may appear,—viz. that of placing the Company's Chaplains on a more suitable rank relatively to the several grades in the civil service: and as from the nature of their education and office they cannot go out as boys, a proper rank in the Table of the Hon. Company's Precedency should be assigned them on their arrival; viz. Those termed Junior Chaplains on the same grade with Factors—The Senior Chaplains with Junior Merchants—The Presidency Chaplains of St. John's Cathedral with Senior Merchants—and the Archdeacon with the Company's Advocate-General, all according to their respective priority of Rank. To advert to such a precedence in our own country would be deservedly ridiculed; in a country, however, like India, governed in a great measure by the force of opinion, it is a matter of more consequence than will be generally believed, *if* our object be to impress on the minds of the natives the sacred character of our religion and the respectability of the Priesthood. The rank assigned to each individual by the Table of Precedence is regarded with a most punctilious attention by all classes among our own countrymen, who from early habits are led to pay more

respect to outward appearances than they generally merit. In the prevailing opinion of the natives, a superiority of rank is the very acme of all perfection. They are from childhood such servile observers of the very minutiæ of Precedency, and such abject slaves to all their numerous forms of Courtesy, that they know no other way of judging than by outward appearances. When, therefore, they have from their infancy been taught to pay the most devoted deference to their own Priests, and perceive that our Clergy in general society, wherever precedency or courtesy is publicly observed, hold an inferior rank, (for they know the exact precedence assigned to every grade in the service) it is not probable that they can entertain very high notions of our religion; and if they do not, how can we reasonably expect that they will become converts to it. The Asiatic in his ideas—in his habits of life—in his notions of religion—in his unvarying observance of its forms, and under his general view of things, must not be contrasted with the native of Africa, or the islander of the South Seas; and, consequently, in his conversion there are difficulties to be surmounted, and these considerably increased by his attachment and adherence to *Caste*, which many zealous members of our Societies at home, whose object is the propagation of our holy Religion, do not fully comprehend, or will not take into the general account. Hence the importance which ought to be, *specially in that*

country, attached to a regular ministry is completely lost sight of. The most fanciful speculations after conversion, as if the objects of our benevolence were a rude and uncivilized people, are greedily laid hold of;—while the very means by which the success of our efforts might be rationally expected, are totally neglected; and all thoughts as to the religious interests of the numerous and widely dispersed *Members of our own Church* are absorbed in the vortex of a visionary enthusiasm.

By the foregoing expression it is not intended to decry any legitimate attempt to convert the natives of India, but the method by which such conversion has been hitherto attempted. In the furtherance of that great object it must be had in remembrance that the natives of India are a civilized and polished People;* attached to their religion, however absurd its dogmas must appear to us; and more advanced in learning than is here generally credited: They are a people whose sobriety and honesty are conspicuous—whose resentments, when roused, are not easily appeased; and, withal, proud and high-minded.† To convert such a people to our profession of faith, must be a

* " I know no part of the Population except the mountain " tribes, who can, with any propriety of language, be called un- " civilized."—*Bishop Heber.*

† " Little do the majority of those whom I have seen deserve " the gentle and imbecile character often assigned to them."— *Ibid.*

work of difficulty as well as of time; and if we do not pursue the proper and regular means, we shall not accelerate conversion, but retard it: Perhaps we may do much worse; for if the means we make use of to produce conversion should by temerity in our proceedings provoke their resentments, or by a careless indifference to the dignity of our Church excite their contempt, the consequences may be serious, and the error irretrievable.*

It may here be remarked, that such is the effect that outward appearances have on the mind of the Native, that he is in a manner governed in his opinions and actions by any superficial display of consequential greatness: Hence in all the religious Shows or Ceremonies peculiar to that Country there is much pageantry and ostentatious pomp, which tends to furnish him with a belief that there is some HIDDEN CHARM in the object of his idolatry. As then his attention is thus attracted by superficial appearances, if we would make him a convert to our Church, we must give that Church a certain dignity in his eyes—a dignity commensurate with his notions of outward or worldly grandeur, and which may ultimately lead him to seriously contemplate that

* When Christianity has once obtained a footing in a heathen country, and planted there a Colony, which after a period of seeming prosperity and promise, has been ejected, or crushed by violence, the Cause of the Gospel receives a signal detriment; the prince of darkness erects a trophy, which renders very difficult a fresh attempt to plant there the Standard of the Cross.—*Bishop of Chester's Sermon.*

beautifully grand assemblage of Christian Graces that constitutes the supremacy of our Religion over every other Religion that does, or ever did exist in the world.

It follows then that the best and indeed the most reasonable way to attract the attention of the Native to the due reverence of our Church Establishment, is to place its ministers, as already urged, on an equally respectable footing with the Civil Service, so as to give to them that influential weight in society, which would have the effect of inducing the natives to regard them with that deference they ever pay to the higher orders of the Civil Servants in the Company's employ: And this would be effectually done by the correspondent Rank proposed. Without such influential weight in a society like that of India, the Chaplains cannot command the respect of those among whom they move; and without that respect the Natives will never be induced to regard them as Ministers of a Religion worthy their most serious attention: And if they be not imperceptibly led, or gradually persuaded to consider its Precepts and reflect upon its Truths; and thus, step by step, allured to admire the economy of Redemption; how can we possibly expect them to become Converts to its Faith? It is therefore by an outward shew of respect on the part of the Government, and those in local authority, to the Clergy as a Body, and also by themselves as a Body being Patterns of benevolence as well as

Teachers of Religion—in fine, by their Examples as well as by their Exhortations that Conversion, humanly speaking, is to be expected.

In all acts of charity and benevolence the Clergy are placed as beacons on a hill, and are more particulary called on in the words of their divine Master, "to let their lights shine before men." But by paying them in a nominal currency, 10 per cent. inferior in value to the *actually-current* rupee, the income of the Chaplains is made to appear much larger than it in fact is, thereby producing a detrimental effect, as much more is consequently expected from them than they have the means of doing; and thus much discredit is undeservedly attached to the line of conduct, which necessity and not their will may have compelled them to adopt. But wherefore should not the two Presidency or Cathedral Chaplains, *as* acknowledged by the standing Regulations to be civil Chaplains, in a place where house-rent runs away with one-third of their allowances, be paid in the same coin as are the civil servants on the Establishment? And if, because house-rent is not so heavy in the upper Provinces, it should be deemed unnecessary to pay the other Chaplains in the same proportion, why should they not be paid in the same rupee in which the military servants are paid? On what ground, in common equity, are they paid in an imaginary rupee of such inferior value, as the nominally current? It will possibly be advanced, that the Judges of the Supreme

Court and the Bishops are so paid. But their situations, as to income and exchange of money, time of service, and pension, with the manner of appointment, &c. are so different, that no just comparison can exist. The Chaplains are more immediate servants of the Company, and on that ground, should be paid in the same coin as their other servants. And when it is considered that they have no places of great emolument like the other branches in the service to look to, they have a still stronger claim to the liberality of the Court, who, it is considered, would not on a just representation of facts refuse to increase their income, so far as to the directing it to be paid in a *real*, and not according to an *imaginary* rupee.

As the Chaplains, not only as a body but in their own individual persons, are required so to conduct themselves in public that men may see their good works; it must be evident that, in order to enable them *so to conduct themselves*, every Regulation should be cancelled that does in any way operate to their disadvantage, by tending to create a supposition, or encourage even a surmise that self-interest or pecuniary advantage is the leading principle by which they are governed in the discharge of duty. An allusion is here made to the existing Regulations as to Burial Fees, which are collected by the undertaker, and so identified with his charges, that many on paying such bills (who are incapable from feelings of affection towards the deceased indi-

vidual of examining the account, or unwilling from motives of respect to his memory to object to the items,) are often led to believe that the Presidency Chaplains participate more largely in the gross amount than they actually do: And thus from a misconception or misapprehension on their part, the odium of pressing heavily on the perhaps scanty means of the widow and orphan is often most undeservedly attached to them. Whether *such odium* be merited or not, *it* must have a pernicious effect: *It* injures the Cause of Religion; for pulpit oratory without charity may be justly likened to a tinkling cymbal, and be estimated of the same intrinsic value. The evil arising from such fees being paid to the Chaplains, might be so entirely removed by cancelling the Regulation, that it should not be in the power of the greatest enemy of our Church to place such an onus on their shoulders as that of participating in such unhallowed plunder. As to the undertaker's charges they are so unreasonable, and indeed enormous, that they have become a public grievance, pressing so heavily on that part of the community, which in such cases suffer most, *the middling class*, that they imperiously call for the beneficent interposition of the Local Authorities: And there appears no reason why the charges complained of should not be placed under the same restriction as those of the undertakers at Paris; and if in so large a metropolis any restrictions can be effectually en-

forced to the benefit of the public, why should they not with equal capability be carried into effect in such a city as Calcutta.

The Burial Fees, and those for Vaults and Monuments, which as being identified in the undertaker's charges, might be collected by the vestry-clerk, and handed over by him to the Vestry, to be placed to the Poor Fund, together with the Pewage of the Cathedral and the specified Fees for Monuments erected in that edifice, instead of the annual allowance made by Government to that Fund. Such allowance to be proportionably divided between the two Presidency Chaplains in lieu of the pecuniary loss they would sustain. And although by the arrangement the Chaplains would be losers in point of private income, they would be gainers in public esteem, and thus the balance would be considerably in their favour. Under this impression the author suggested the foregoing measure in a letter to Mr. Secretary Dart, which is annexed.* And, as in it there is an allusion to

* Sir,

As ecclesiastical arrangements are now making before the Honourable Court, I beg to submit to you, for their consideration, the propriety of taking away the fees on monuments and brick vaults from the Presidency Chaplains, and appropriating the same, together with the balance of monies arising from the Pewage, (after deducting the amount of lighting up the cathedral for the evening service, the punkas, and other monthly expenses) to the Support of the Poor.

In respect to the established fees, if they were not collected, and all classes were allowed, *ad libitum*, to erect buildings, the

the right of property in the Cathedral, on the part of certain individuals, it may be proper to state, that the ground on which the present Cathedral stands, was given by a Hindoo Rajah for the specific purpose of building a Christian Church—that the

burial-ground would be very soon filled with vaults [brick graves] and monuments; and the Government would consequently be obliged, at an enormous expense, to purchase from time to time additional land. It should otherwise be recollected that there is not a parish in England in which such fees, according to the existing modus or custom, are not paid. Nevertheless the payment of these fees is the subject of general animadversion in Calcutta, tending very much to depreciate the two Presidency Chaplains in the estimation of the public. Some unpleasant remarks have also been made respecting the payment for seats in the cathedral by some of those who have an undoubted property in the building. All unpleasant remarks would be silenced, and the Chaplains would stand on much higher ground, if, instead of the sum of 800 sicca rupees per month paid by order of the Honourable Court for the relief of the Poor, *the Fees* and *Pewage* were appropriated to that beneficent purpose; the poor would be considerable gainers by the exchange, and the exchange would give in every respect a very general satisfaction.

I would propose that the salary of 300 current or 265 sicca rupees attached to the situation of the Ordinary of the Gaol be added to the 800 sicca rupees now paid to the Support of the Poor. That this sum, making near 1100, be divided between the two Presidency Chaplains—the situation of Ordinary being attached to the senior—the charge of the burial-ground being given to the junior. That the fees as now established be collected by the Vestry Clerk and carried to the account of the Poor Fund, and that a quarterly return of Receipts, Disbursements, and outstanding Balances, be made to Government, officially signed by the Vestry.

Should such an arrangement not meet the approbation of the Honourable Court, I humbly hope some measure will be adopted,

Church, now the Cathedral, was built on that ground by private subscription, aided by the proceeds of a Lottery to the amount of about 12,000*l.* given by the Local Government for that special purpose: And in order to induce the public to come forward on the occasion, several of the Subscribers had seats allotted to them and their families, according to the liberality displayed in their subscriptions. These families, with no small degree of justice on their side, complain of having been ejected from their seats and obliged to pay for others; yet from the well known generous and liberal feeling by which the community of Calcutta have been on all occasions actuated, it may with some degree of

as I do assure you that there is not any thing that brings the two Presidency Chaplains into such disrepute, and excites such hostile feeling towards them as the burial fees. In respect to reimbursing the Chaplains for the pecuniary loss they would sustain, I contend it would be better for their respectability and the advancement of religion that they should be losers, in a pecuniary point of view, than that the fees should remain as they are *their property;* and though one of the Presidency Chaplains, who would most materially suffer in point of income,* yet I consider it a conscientious discharge of my duty thus unreservedly to represent the existing evil for the consideration of the Honourable Court.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your very obedient humble Servant,

April 17th, 1822. HENRY SHEPHERD, *Sen. Chap.*

* By giving up an exclusive claim to the pay and allowance of the appointment of Ordinary, to which I was nominated by the Marquis of Hastings, in addition to my share of the Burial Fees, as the Senior Chaplain, for at this time I had in my pocket *the Court's Order to return to my Rank.*

confidence be affirmed, that if they were assured that the payments for the Pews went entirely to the Poor Fund, they would rest satisfied with the arrangements that have from necessity taken place; inasmuch as knowing that those who were benefitted by the Pewage were those who had the *best claim*—THE POOR OF CALCUTTA.

There are other matters relative to Clerical forms, and usages, which may be fairly deemed inexpedient in India, and from the nature of the climate vexatious to individuals; but upon which, as being of minor importance, it is unnecessary to dwell. They would be best left to the discretion of the Bishop, who should steadily keep in view, how far the observance of them may be most advantageously calculated for religious purposes in a country like India. Still there is a form, which by the sanction of Parliament has of late been introduced into our eastern dominions; and a usage, which has too long been permitted to be practised there, both of the highest importance in their consequences, and which should, therefore, not be passed over in silence: Indeed, as both are beyond the dispensing power of the Bishop, a few observations on the nature of each appear to be indispensably requisite—The form, or ceremony, alluded to is that of Marriage, as allowed to be performed in Calcutta by the Minister of the Scotch Church—The usage, or practice, is that which exists in respect to Suttees.

And 1st, as respects the *form* or *ceremony* of Scotch marriages in India, it may be observed that, from a recent event having drawn the attention of the House of Lords (on the suggestion of the Earl of Malmesbury) to the Scotch, or as they are termed Gretna Green, marriages, a most favourable opportunity presents itself for soliciting a similar attention to *Scotch marriages in Calcutta,* as no less meriting the reconsideration of the legislature. In adverting, therefore, to the confusion which unavoidably arises from the Minister of the Scotch Church being permitted to perform the ceremony of marriage according to the Church of Scotland as by law established, and hence without those restrictions, which bind the Clergy of the Church of England, it may not be unnecessary to state in what manner such permission was originally obtained.

Some months after the arrival of the Minister of the Scotch Church in India, it was rumoured that he had sent home a Petition to Parliament for permission to perform parochial duties in Calcutta; in consequence of which a correspondence took place between the Archdeacon of Calcutta and the Scotch Minister as to the truth of the report; and at the same time a request was made to be favoured with a sight of the Petition. The truth of *the* report was admitted, but the request for a sight of *the* Petition was refused. The Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Calcutta were consequently convened; a Counter-petition was drawn up, signed,

and presented to the Bishop; who approved and forwarded the same to be laid before Parliament. On the receipt of the *Counter-petition* in England, it was unfortunately considered an unnecessary proceeding to present *it* to Parliament, as a report was industriously circulated that the Petition from the Minister of the Scotch Church, *had been, or would be, withdrawn.* In this state the matter rested; and as nothing more transpired for upwards of twelve months, the Clergy of the Diocese of Calcutta felt satisfied that no farther infringement on their rights would be attempted, considering themselves placed under the same Protection as the Clergy of any other Diocese in the Province of Canterbury. But while thus lulled into a fancied security, they were not only surprised to find that a *Petition* from the Minister of the Scotch Church had been presented to Parliament, but that their *Counter-petition* had never come under consideration; and that in consequence of the suppression of the latter, the prayer of the former had been granted.

The *Permission* thus allowed to the Minister of the Scotch Church to perform the ceremony of marriage, although in some degree surreptitiously obtained, and in its consequences affecting the interests of the Clergy in India, it is not here intended to obtrude on attention: *But that which is now submitted to consideration are the mischievous effects arising from two Church Establishments,*

having equal power on the same spot, though governed and regulated by different laws. And it must here be observed, that the Minister of the Scotch Church is not restricted by any of those regulations to which the Clergy of the Established Church are bound to attend, such as banns, licenses, and canonical hours. The Parties, when they apply to him for his services, experience no delay from the publication of *banns* —incur no expense from the necessity of procuring a *license*—and can be married at *any place,* and at *any hour,* they may please to appoint. The Parties who apply to the Presidency Chaplains of the Established Church must be married at *the church,* and in *canonical hours;* they must experience delay in the publication of *banns,* or incur the expense of a *license.* Some cases can be cited wherein the Minister of the Scotch Church has married the Parties after they had been refused by a Presidency Chaplain, because they could not produce the required license, nor had been called in Church.* It is not meant by this assertion to cast any reflection on the Minister of the Scotch Church, as it must be taken for granted that the parties

* An officer of rank placed his daughter at a school, previously to his assuming the command of a detachment of the army on active service. Some months after, a young man waited on the author, requesting his attendance to marry him to the young lady. The request was refused, on the ground that the father's consent had not been obtained, nor any of the

concerned would not tell him of their unsuccessful application elsewhere; but it is advanced to prove the mischievous effects arising from the late Act of Parliament, in reference to the celebration of marriages at the Scotch Church in Calcutta; and which *mischievous effects*, it is humbly conceived would be in some measure obviated, if the services of the Minister of that Church were confined to those cases, where *both parties* (and not *one* of them, as in the words of the Act) *have been educated, and brought up in that persuasion;* or otherwise *be restricted in the same manner as those of the Clergy of the Established Church.*

How far the marriage in canonical hours at the Cathedral is absolutely requisite may be somewhat difficult to decide, as that must depend in a great measure on the Marriage Act, *in all its bearings*, extending to India: and therefore it is left to those who by their professional studies are qualified to determine that point: But it may be remarked, that if such observance be absolutely required in Calcutta, it cannot be less so in the upper provinces; and how is it to be duly observed where we have no Churches: And if it be merely a matter of Church Discipline, it ought to be dispensed with in a climate

forms required by the Church to authorize his acquiescence regularly gone through: An application to another Chaplain was also on the same grounds refused. The young man, who proved to be THE SON of *the mistress of the school*, applied afterwards to the Minister of the Scotch Church, and was married.

like that of India; where in the hot season individuals must suffer by being obliged to go through a burning sun, and where in all seasons it is attended with a serious interruption to the Public Service: Whereas the former custom of marrying at the Church in the evening, when the public offices are closed, was every way calculated for the convenience of the residents in that country. As then the change, which ought never to have been hazarded, but for evident advantage, is of itself an evil, the former state of things in respect to Marriage, should be restored, as being best calculated for public and private accommodation.

2ndly, In regard to the *usage* or *practice* which exists in India relative to the Suttees, how much is it to be lamented that the horrible custom of burning widows with the lifeless bodies* of their husbands should have been so long permitted to disgrace a country, governed by a people not only themselves professing the mild doctrines of Christianity, but displaying a zeal for the propagation of them. It is true, that meetings after meetings have taken place at some of our principal cities,

* If the husband should die at such a distance as to preclude the possibility of the widow burning with his body; his sword, dagger, turban, or any part of his dress being brought to the widow, the Suttee can take place: When this occurs, the widow having ascended the pile, the mournful token of her husband's death is placed upon her lap.

for the express purpose of putting an end to a custom so revolting to the common feelings of human nature—a custom never exceeded in barbarity, or inhumanity, by any nation under Heaven. Indeed, not long since a meeting was held in the city of York, for the purpose of petitioning Government to interpose their authority in respect to Suttees in India; and, as there could be, in an assembly of men professing Christianity, but *one* sentiment on such a subject, the petition was eagerly agreed to, and has been, as may be supposed, duly presented: But strange to say, no feasible plan, on any one occasion, has ever been proposed, by which any hopes of abolishing the inhuman custom might be reasonably entertained. This has probably originated from the want of local information, or that knowledge of the opinions, the manners, the habits, and the religious tenets of the natives, on the part of those who have composed such meetings; and, as the same silence upon this point has been hitherto observed, even in the Societies for Promoting and Propagating Christian knowledge, and as no one measure has been proposed by either of the late learned Prelates of Calcutta, or by any other member of those bodies, it may be presumed, that the same dearth of information has prevailed, in a no less degree, in those venerable assemblies.

That such a custom, so horrible in itself, and so degrading to human nature, should have so long

prevailed, is certainly not very creditable to us, holding the rank we do in the Peninsula of India; but referring to the reasons which have been assigned for the non-adoption of coercive measures in restraining the natives from the barbarous practice—It has been advanced, that the Court of Directors have, in the orders they have issued, gone as far as they consistently can go, without hazarding the internal peace of the country, and that the local Governments have acted with as much zeal and spirit in the observance, and in the enforcement of such orders, as they were justified. It has thus been contended, that neither the Court nor the local Governments can take more coercive measures than those which they have already adopted towards abolishing Suttees, without a direct, or what they politically term, an *unwarrantable* interference with the religious rites and ceremonies of the natives—that such an unwarrantable interference would tend to excite disaffection—that if on one point more than another the prejudices of the people are against us, it is on the subject of Suttees—and that to oppose these prejudices might and would endanger our very existence in the East. If many, who thus seem to advocate a continuance of the present system, would take the trouble to investigate the subject more narrowly, and not be so prone to take up with the opinions of others, they would discover that these dreadful sacrifices form no essential part of the Hindoo system of

Religion; and that these burnings-alive, amidst the horrible din of discordant instruments, and the unhallowed shouts of enthusiastic thousands, proceed from the force of education, or perhaps from an organized system of an intolerant priesthood.

For, strange as it may at first appear, if a reference be made to the number of Suttees which have taken place during the last ten, fifteen, or twenty years, or for any longer given period, it will be found that two-thirds of these abhorred piles have been erected in those districts that have been the longest under our immediate control; and, that the further we proceed up the country, the fewer Suttees are observable.

To account for this, we must advert to the invasion of India by the Moguls, and to the unvaried opposition ever since that period by the Mussulmauns, wherever in power, to the religious rites and ceremonies of the Hindoos. Perhaps to no *one* rite were their Mussulmaun conquerors more hostile than to the barbarous practice of burning women. And thus in the upper provinces the abominable custom has, in a great measure, died away; or at any rate it is far less frequent than in those districts more immediately under the eye of our Government: For it is a mistaken notion, that the Shaster ordains a woman of such or such a rank, or caste, to burn on the death of her husband, and, in default of such immolation, to be driven in disgrace from all society. The real state of the case is

this—if a woman, of a certain specified rank or caste, should, on the demise of her husband, from the artifice of designing individuals, for interested purposes, be induced to *declare her intention* of burning, it is required by the Shaster that she fulfil such a declared intention: And, in the event of not burning, for no revocation by the Shaster is allowed, she is degraded, and becomes an outcast. Thus this act of burning is literally a point of honour on the part of the wretched victims, and an act of murder in those who are in any manner accessories to the deed. If it were a system of Religion, as shedding human blood it would have no claim to toleration from any Government; but, as a system of Priestcraft, it may more consistently be considered as a system of murder; and as such it ought, even by the strong arm of Power, to be suppressed. Happily, however, there is no necessity to adopt coercive measures—the act of burning is a point of honour, and like other false points of honour, a stumbling-block that ought to be removed.

With a view of establishing a simple, as well as an effectual, remedy against this act, so revolting to human nature, it is proposed, that an Edict be published by the Government, declaratory that the Suttees shall continue to be allowed to take place under *the* Regulations now in force; but that at the same time, as the Government cannot refrain from expressing their utter abhorrence of such

proceedings, they do for the future determine, *that no Son, Brother, or Cousin of the first or second degree, of any female so burning, shall be permitted to hold any situation, or renew any leases, under the Government.** And there is every reason to entertain a firm persuasion, that such a decree would so effectually operate in deterring, from their atrocious practices, many of those, who under the present system employ both fraud and artifice to entrap the widow into the fatal and irrevocable declaration which consigns her to ignominy or death—that, instead of the numerous self-devoted victims which, to our disgrace as a Christian nation, yearly expire on the funereal pile, thousands in after times will live to bless the Government, who have had the power, and the will, thus to deliver them from the despotic and artful dominion of a sanguinary priesthood.

It may now be of use to recapitulate the objects intended to be established by the Remarks contained in the foregoing pages: And, 1st, in respect

* The author feels a confidence in advancing this proposition, the more strongly from its coinciding with the opinion of an individual, who from thirty years' service in the Upper Provinces of Bengal, and his own superior attainments in oriental literature—from a continual friendly intercourse with the most respectable natives among the higher classes, and an intimate knowledge of their language, as also of their manners, customs, and prejudices, both civil and religious, is enabled to form the most competent judgment on the subject.

to the expediency of appointing a second Bishop to the eastward of the Cape, nothing can be more apposite to the suggestion, nor more powerful in its support than the arguments of the Bishop of Chester in his representation of "the "utter disproportion between the Labours of the "Indian Episcopate and the Provision made for "their discharge." Hence the several extracts from his Lordship's Discourse (and which have been selected as coming from high authority and tending to establish the expediency of such appointment) have been introduced with a view of impressing on the powerful "the awful responsibility that "rests upon the heads of those who have the "mastery over thousands, nay, millions in either "hemisphere, if they oppose, or but negligently "and reluctantly second the efforts which are made "to rescue from the depths of ignorance and the "abominations of idolatry, and to place within the "pale of salvation beings who, like themselves, "are objects of redeeming love." And in furtherance of the proposed Episcopacy, in the establishment of which so many thousands of those already in the Faith are so deeply interested, the same Prelate's observation may be advanced, that in restoring to the f mily of believers those, who have fallen away from the truth as it is in Jesus, is a task of the greatest difficulty and hazard: "*For if after* "*they have escaped the pollutions of the world* "*through the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour*

*" Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, " and overcome, the latter end is worse with them " than the beginning."**

2ndly, In support of what has been already urged on the expediency of forming the Cape, the Mauritius, and St. Helena, into one Archdeaconry, and thus giving to those three Colonies an Ecclesiastical Establishment no less respectable than that of Ceylon, or New South Wales, stronger arguments cannot be adduced than those which fell from the Rev. Dr. Philpotts at the late meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts: If, as that gentleman then stated, our Colonies have hitherto been neglected;—if Spain and Portugal have taken infinite and unceasing pains to establish the superstitions of popery, while our own Colonies are nearly left without a religious Establishment, (the truth of which Goa and other Settlements of a similar description will fully substantiate) if these observations be established as facts from the concurrent testimonies of those best informed by residence or travel in those distant lands, we may surely be led to hope that those Prelates, who on that occasion evinced their approbation of Dr. Philpotts' reasoning, will so effectually exert their influence with the Government, that we shall no more hear of the unhallowed policy of Great Britain when compared with the countries already named. And if it be an unwise

* 2nd Peter, ch. 2, ver. 20.

and unsafe course to neglect the religious instruction of our Colonies, the expediency of the proposed plan must be so palpably evident, that no doubt can be entertained as to the favourable result of a recommendation from such powerful advocates in the cause of pure and undefiled Religion, as the Prelates of our Church.

3rdly, The proof of what has been urged, respecting the present system of Furlough, and the evil arising from Stations being for years left without an officiating Minister, cannot be better substantiated than by what was, at the forementioned Meeting advanced by the Bishop of Llandaff, in respect to the present state of our Church in China, in consequence of the absence of its Minister. If the Plans, as already suggested on this head, were duly considered, and carried into effect, the Clergy would not be compelled, from prudential motives, to avail themselves of the Furlough as soon as by service entitled to it, nor would the Church be left for two or three years without an officiating Chaplain.

4thly, In regard not only to the expediency, but to the actual importance of adopting some measure for ensuring the services of a Chaplain, whenever the British soldiery in India are employed on active service. All arguments must be unnecessary when a reference is made to His Majesty's commands, enforced by the Articles of War. That a suitable provision should be made to enable the Chaplain

to meet the encreased expenditure in taking the field, and to remunerate him for his arduous duties, must be indispensably requisite; and perhaps the most advisable mode of making such provision would be by granting the allowances, which were formerly drawn by the Rev. Dr. Mc Kinnon,* as the amount depended on the number of King's regiments employed in the field; and thus the remuneration would be regulated according to the duties performed.

Lastly, in respect to an efficient and respectable Ministry, affording the best and surest prospect of propagating the Gospel amongst our Indian subjects, much has already been said, and little on this subject remains to be observed. It has been inferred, that previously to the erection of India into a See, and the arrival of Bishop Middleton, that the services of the Church were ill attended by the laity—its duties neglected, and its Clergy not respected. So far from such being the case, never was there a period when the Church was better attended by the laity, nor the duty more zealously performed, nor the Clergy so independently situated as when the Marquiss Wellesley was at the head of the Government of India. To advert to the labours of the Clergy, who were then officiating in Calcutta, is only an act of justice to the memory of those who have finished their course, and are no more; their

* This Chaplain died from the effects of fatigue whilst serving with the army under the personal command of Lord Lake.

names must be still remembered by many of the present Directors, and their zeal cannot be forgotten. Surely then it is not equitable to represent the European Society at that period in India so totally neglectful of their religious duties as to be little better than Heathens; nor is it just to maintain that the saving truths of religion have been only within the last fifteen years preached, or with due attention regarded in the metropolis of the East. In an attendance on the public service of our Church, the Marquiss Wellesley when in Calcutta set an example worthy of his exalted situation, and which was not lost on our countrymen there resident. To the Clergy his Lordship held out every encouragement; and by his munificence placed them in a situation no less independent than the gentlemen of the Civil Service. It was under the auspices of the Marquiss Cornwallis that St. John's Church, now the Cathedral, was built; and the interest his Lordship took in the observance of public worship, and it may be said in every thing connected with the good of the Church, is so fully recorded in the proceedings of the Vestry, at which his Lordship on several occasions presided, as to satisfy the most credulous that the duties of religion were, even at that time, with due solicitude observed. In the Marquiss Wellesley it has just been remarked that the Clergy of Calcutta found a liberal patron, and a powerful friend: and hence the present allowances, *contrasted* with what they in his

Lordship's time received, furnish a strong argument for the proposed increase, as far as paying them in the *actually current*, and not in a *nominal* rupee.

It has been already advanced, that the best and safest mode of propagating the gospel is by an efficient Clergy; and that to make them efficient, a suitable Rank and Station in Society must be assigned them—that without that rank and station they can have no sufficiently influential power, and without that influential power their best endeavours and most zealous labours must in a manner fail. But if the disparaging rank they now hold in society be not advanced, and those mortifying regulations which tend to their depression be not revised, their energies must be weakened; and the field of their efforts in the Christian cause so far from being extended must be circumscribed: And, if their just rights and fair expectations are to be placed at the arbitrary disposal of any individual, who from an unavoidable want of local information must, for a time after entering upon the duties of his high office, be a passive instrument in the hands of others, although in other respects blessed with the literary attainments of a whole College, every impulse would be given to an unfriendly feeling among the Chaplains; and an incitement to intrigue and jealousy—a spur to overreach each other—and a spring to every unworthy passion would therefrom be set in motion: And thus Episcopacy, now established in India with a view of producing the most beneficial

effects, might become in a great degree defeated in the full attainment of its object.

In order however to place the Ecclesiastical Establishment of India in such a state of respectable independence as should enlarge the sphere of action in the propagation of the Gospel, the authority of the Prelate should not be advanced on a demolition of the rights and privileges of the Chaplains; nor should the *consequence* of the one be increased at the *expense* of the other. But the GRAND OBJECT so much at heart, would be best forwarded by the enaction of such wholesome Regulations, that while they should tend to uphold the just power and authority—the high dignity and influential consequence of the Bishop, they should be directed to the enhancing, not to the disparaging, the private Clergy in the public eye; and to effect this, they should be so formed as to unite them in such bonds of Peace and brotherly love in disseminating the truths of our holy religion, that our countrymen in that distant region, as well as our native subjects, may be led to consider a Minister of the Gospel, as a PADRE not only in word but in works; and also to recognize in the Bishop of Calcutta a BURRAH PADRE*—Burrah in the fullest and highest

* PADRE, *i. e.* Father, is a term invariably applied to the Clergy by Europeans as well as natives; and Burrah Padre, or Lord Padre, to the Bishop. BURRAH signifies great, grand, illustrious, chief, &c. Burrah Lord is applied to the Governor-General if a British Peer, Burrah Saib, if not; and BURRAH PADRE cannot

sense of the meaning it conveys, his Lordship being in equity and firmness—in acts of kindness and benevolence the encouraging and protecting PADRE of his CLERGY.

be more happily translated than in the language of the Bishop of Chester, where his Lordship alludes to the late Bishop Heber, as the "CHIEF MISSIONARY of the East."

The SHASTER, as a Hindoo work of unquestionable authority, has been referred to in the foregoing Remarks relative to the Suttees, page 66: It is literally a Treatise on Science; but it is generally consulted and quoted on points of Theology. The Four Vedas are in fact to the Hindoo, what the Koran is to the Mussulmaun, and the HOLY BIBLE to the CHRISTIAN.

ERRATA.

Page 24. *For*, of returning to Madagascar—*read*, of returning to Madagascar, the native country of their parents.

Page 42. *For*, in accordance to—*read*, in accordance with.

Page 46. *Read*, and that respectful courtesy in Civil Society to its Ministers.

Page 54. *Instead of*, such an onus on their shoulders—*read*, such a stigma on their character.

Page 55. *For*, capability—*read*, success.

Page 68. *Read*, second degree of any female so burning, who may be directly or indirectly an abettor of the act.

POSTSCRIPT.

NEARLY two years have elapsed since the appointment of the late Bishop James to the See of Calcutta took place, when I ventured to submit to the press the foregoing Remarks.—They were then received by many of the highest authority in Church and State with favour and indulgence: and on the present elevation of Dr. Turner to that Bishoprick I am induced to obtrude them again on the notice of those, who may feel an interest in the prosperity of our Eastern Church and the welfare of its Ministers. Having for some time deferred a second publication, in the hope that I might have been enabled to avail myself of the observations of others for the correction of errors, or removal of doubts, I am the more anxious, before another Bishop leaves this country for India, to excite a kindly feeling of attention to our Ecclesiastical Establishment in the East: If then I were to attempt to correct the many imperfections, or to make alterations in the disposition of the matter, the series of the pages would be changed, and the publication unavoidably retarded. With a view therefore to avoid delay on the eve of the embarkation of the recently appointed Prelate for India; and in the hope that the importance of the subject will atone for the unceremonious manner in which it is again introduced, as also for the familiarity with which it is discussed, I shall proceed to consider the several points in the order in which they have in the preceding sheets been submitted to consideration: And if, in my endeavours to be perspicuous where I may

hitherto have been obscure, I should be led to speak of my own acts, I hope not to incur the charge of self-sufficiency; but trust that such my efforts at perspicuity may be imputed to an honest wish to state clearly and fairly things as they really are, and to place facts beyond the reach of doubt.

Page 12. *In* 1805-6, *a Plan for Church Government, &c.*—This measure was by myself suggested;* and I would not at this distance of time hazard such an assertion, had I not wherewith to establish the priority of this suggestion to any proposed plan from the pen of the late Rev. Dr. Buchannan—the warm and zealous advocate for a more enlarged Episcopacy in India, than I at that time contemplated.

Page 14. "*The duty incumbent on a Christian Government of providing for the Religious Instruction, &c.*— It is strange to observe, how much attention has been paid to the religious wants of some of our Colonies, whilst of others little less than a total neglect may be observable; among the latter may be adduced our possessions eastward of the Cape. For years have we had two Bishops in our remnant of territory in North America; and of late we have had in our more populous and wealthy Colonies in the West Indies *also* two Bishops, while in our far more extensive territories and important possessions in the East, we have only ONE. Surely this may be considered as an oversight of no ordinary kind:—And when the riches, the population, and vast extent of our Eastern possessions, with their remoteness, be brought into comparison with the importance of such our territory in the North, and our Islands in the West, it is to be hoped that the energetic language of the Bishop of Lon-

* This is one of those suggestions to which I advert in the 5th page as having been carried into effect. The formation of New South Wales into an Archdeaconry is another; and as I advance no one thing in regard to self which I am not prepared to prove, I beg to add that I am no less willing to do so, whenever required.

don* will have due weight with Government—and that, as the duty of making a no less suitable provision for the support of our Church to the Eastward of the Cape cannot be denied, so is it to be earnestly desired, that under the auspices of his Grace of Canterbury THAT DUTY will be no longer evaded, nor THAT PROVISION any longer postponed.

Page 20. *Ceylon and New South Wales having been formed into Archdeaconries since British India, &c.*— If a sustaining power for the protection of our Church in those Colonies be indisputable, some form of Church Government must be at the Cape and the Mauritius equally indispensable: And when what has occurred since the cession of the latter to England be taken into consideration, it will be found that this measure has been already delayed too long; and that an advantage has been taken which I am apprehensive will not easily be remedied—I allude to the appointment of a resident Roman Catholic Bishop to that Island.

To place this matter in such a point of view as in all its bearings to free it from obscurity, I must trace circumstances from the time of our first taking possession of the Mauritius; when shortly after the capture of that island, I was there in the double capacity of Colonial and Military Chaplain. Being the first Protestant Minister that had been officiating there for many years, my services were not confined to my own countrymen; many children of the French Protestants I baptized, and often at their requisition I performed other professional duties. Under the auspices of the Governor the present Protestant Church was built; and under his patronage a Bible Society was formed: And as I was on friendly terms with the Catholic Clergy I invariably experienced from them, as well as the French community, any thing but opposition to my views. These circumstances I am induced

* Late Bishop of Chester.

to state, as best calculated to shew the general feeling of the people on the subject of religion; and how little they were disposed to bigotry. The Rev. Mr. Jones was subsequently sent from home as Chaplain to that Colony, and I returned to Calcutta.

In the appointment of a Chaplain to the Mauritius, the Colonial Department unhappily considered that all, that was requisite for the support of our Church in that Colony, had been done. The Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland thought otherwise—they took advantage of our supineness, and availed themselves of the opportunity of establishing Papistical Episcopacy in this island—thus obtaining an uninterrupted intercourse with the several Roman Catholic Bishops in the East, and securing a direct communication with the Head of the Roman Catholic Church at Goa.* By the Popish Hierarchy in Ireland, Mr. Slater was removed from near Croston, Lancashire, where he was officiating as a Roman Catholic Priest, and was appointed Bishop of the Mauritius. Previous to his embarkation he visited Spain, and returned to Ireland; and being thus fitted for the duties of his office, he sailed for the Mauritius, where he now is in the performance of his episcopal functions. If I were to say more on this subject it might be by some attributed to motives which I utterly disclaim; if I had said less it might be urged that I had manifested a culpable indifference, where the interests of our Church required an unreserved and ingenuous detail of facts: I therefore trust that what I have advanced on this head may be regarded as sufficient to induce those in power to take the proposed measure into consideration; so that they may give to the Cape and its dependencies a Church Establish-

* The Inquisition here is founded on the same principle as that of Portugal; and it is said that the Chief Inquisitor is more powerful than the Archbishop or the Viceroy. The horrors and cruelties of this institution are fully detailed in a narrative of the sufferings of Mr. Dillon, a French gentleman.—See Bishop Hurd on the Inquisition.

ment similar to that which has been separately bestowed on Ceylon and New South Wales.

Page 25. *But as from the remoteness of India, a district remains long unsupplied, &c.*—In the Military branch of the service there are a number of Cadets, who are brought as officers on the strength of the army as vacancies occur. In the Civil department of the service, there are Writers ready to fill vacant appointments; and there can be no satisfactory reason assigned why there should not be a limited number of supernumerary Chaplains, placed at the disposal of the Bishop, to fill vacant appointments. In consequence of the absence of the Chaplain at Canton on furlough, there has been no regular Chaplain at that place for two years. The successors of the Rev. Mr. Mylton and the Rev. Mr. Simpkin, who died last year, if appointed, cannot yet have arrived: The Stations therefore which those gentlemen held must be still vacant and without Divine Service: There are other Stations on this and the other Presidencies precisely in the same state. This evil would be rectified by the measure proposed, and the monthly expense attendant upon it would be too trifling to deserve a thought.*

Page 27. *For under the present Regulations, &c.*—When the ill-advised Regulation here referred to was enacted, or where it is to be found I have not been able to discover: Nevertheless I can confidently assert that it has been enacted since the erection of Calcutta into a See, and that it has been allowed to have a retrospective effect. In its operations I am free to acknowledge that

* Ten Supernumerary Chaplains, *i. e.*—5 for Bengal, 3 for Madras, and 2 for Bombay, at 600 rupees per month, would be an additional expense of 6000 rupees—provided at all the Stations there were Chaplains present—but from deaths, furloughs, and resignations, it may from past experience be expected that these ten will be employed at vacant Stations, where they will consequently receive the salaries attached to those Stations; and therefore the measure should not be considered as imposing an additional expense, to the extent which it may at first sight convey.

it may tend to increase patronage—but in its consequences I am prepared to prove that it *must* be injurious to the interests of the Church in India: And therefore as vitally affecting the best, and most legitimate means of propagating the blessed Truths of our Religion, it ought to be speedily and distinctly abrogated.*

Page 30. *If it be, as the Bishop of Chester* (now London) *asserts it to be, a duty incumbent on those, &c.*—There are few men, I feel persuaded, who will be so hardy as to attempt to controvert such sound and forcible reasoning. What, it may then be asked, must be the prevailing opinion among a people, who by late circumstances have been led to express collectively that warm attachment to their religion, which they individually feel; and who on all occasions have manifested a more than common ardour in the propagation of their faith among those who sit in darkness—nay, what will not be said by that people when it is affirmed without the fear of contradiction, THAT SINCE 1805-6 THERE HAS NEVER BEEN AN OFFICIATING MINISTER WITH THE KING'S TROOPS IN INDIA WHEN ON ACTIVE SERVICE IN THE FIELD: What, I may add, will be His Majesty's sentiments on being informed, that his gracious and special Mandate, for the ensuring the services of Religion to the British Soldiery wherever employed, has for so long a period been a mere *dead letter*.

Should this baneful omission of an imperative duty, as detailed in the preceding pages, not merit the interference of the Prelates of our Church, it is vain to expect that the efforts of an humble Minister of that Church can effect any good, however incontrovertible his statement of facts may be, or however powerfully both Religion and Policy may call for a strict inquiry into the cause of that omission.

* The absurdity of another Regulation, which can only tend to encourage an absence from duty, is so monstrous that I am persuaded the Court would direct its revision, if they were to take into their consideration *quid sit utile, quid non*, in reference to their Clerical Establishment.

The accounting for such a length of time having elapsed since the appointment of a Chaplain to the troops on active service, will tend to shew, whence the cause of the baneful omission here complained of originated: And from a conviction, that the ill consequences either of omissions or measures are always best exposed by a *case*, wherein the evil is rendered fully and practicably apparent, I shall instance *that* of the Chaplain, who was specially appointed by the late Lord Lake to succeed the Rev. Dr. M'Kinnon; and who in obedience to his Lordship's Gen. Orders, joined the army at a heavy personal expense, and which was increased by there not being at the time of his appointment any camp equipage in the public store, nor any Government cattle that could be spared for the carriage of his baggage or his tents when purchased. On this being represented by the Chaplain to Lord Lake, the public officer in charge of the stores was directed to furnish a certificate to the above effect, in order that on the production of it his future claim for a reimbursement of the actual cost, or an adequate remuneration in lieu of it, might be granted. When however this certificate was subsequently presented, on his application to be reimbursed the expenses he had necessarily incurred, he was told that a General Letter had been received from the Court, in which they had abolished all extra allowances whatever *to their Chaplains:* And thus, as already particularized, for 24 years not a single Chaplain has been with any one of our Eastern armies, when actively employed in the face of the enemy. Indeed how could it with any shew of reason be otherwise; as the situation*

* The Chaplain returned to the duties of his former station, when so directed in General Orders; incumbered with a heavy debt contracted in the purchase of tents, camels, &c. which were absolutely necessary to enable him to obey the orders he had received, and part of which he lost by being cut off by the enemy. At this time he had a wife and six children; four were educating in England. And on his joining the army he had a separate establishment to support for his wife and the other two.

in which this Chaplain was placed might be the lot of others, if not much more embarrassing and distressing. It is therefore with a view to shew what has been literally the fact, that this Chaplain's case has been thus cursorily cited; and hence to prove how *ex necessitate rei* it is to make some extra provision for any Chaplain while on actual service with the army in the field.

The next point to be considered is—what provision would be requisite, and in what manner it would be most beneficially made. I should say, pay according to the duty required, and only when that duty is performed.

On a reference to the extent of the Bengal Establishment, when compared with that of Madras and Bombay,* I would propose that the Upper Provinces of the former be erected into a separate Archdeaconry—that the Archdeacon's residence should be at Cawnpore, where the Commander-in-Chief usually resides. That *he* should be the Chaplain-General to the Army in the Field; but that he should receive no extra allowances, except when on actual service with the army, and then only in proportion to the number of H. M. Regiments employed on that service. That in case of his being prevented from joining the army by sickness, or other cause satisfactory to the Commander-in-Chief, the Chaplain officiating in his stead to receive the whole of the extra allowances, to the date of the army returning to their cantonments; at which time such allowances should cease. When the extent of the ceded Districts on the Bengal Establishment, and the consequent line drawn between the Lower and Upper Provinces, by the local Government in all their arrangements come under consideration, the appointment of a

* Ceylon, which is also placed as a separate Archdeaconry under the Bishop, in its extent and importance with these two Presidencies may be estimated in the same ratio as Rutlandshire would be to Yorkshire; surely then the proposed augmentation for Bengal cannot be deemed vainly expensive.

second Archdeacon will not appear to be matter of expediency only, but of sound policy.*

Page 42. "*The fear*" *which has been expressed in reference to the appointment of Bishops to India, &c.*— The fear here expressed is not properly directed, as had men, more advanced in years than the late Prelates, been selected, there probably would not have been, physically speaking, that "waste of valuable life," which has by the Quarterly Review been so fearfully contemplated: But as long as the same system is continued, there will be a cause for fear grounded in *the general opinion of medical practitioners, &c.;* and which will appear but too well supported by past experience, if we advert to the late casualties among the Prelates and Judges, in reference to their respective ages on the assumption of their high official duties.

In the Civil and Military branches of the Company's service we have seen men rising to the highest stations with advantage to the public and honour to themselves; we have also seen, not so frequently perhaps as might have been wished, Barristers elevated to the bench: And it may be added, when has the high office of a Judge in India been discharged with more unwearied perseverance and intellectual ability, than when the judicial seat has been so filled. And at a future period should the door which leads to honour and a wider range of usefulness in the Church of India, be opened to the Chaplains of that Church by the FOSTERING HAND OF ENCOURAGEMENT, it may with confidence be anticipated, from their local knowledge and attainments, their public zeal and private

* Very small indeed is this proposed increase contrasted with that contemplated by Bishop Heber, viz. the appointing Archdeacons to every circuit, so that the interior of every district might be visited once in every year, or oftener as circumstances might require, without removing the Chaplains from their stations: And therefore had his Lordship lived to have carried his plan into effect, there would have been an increase of six Archdeacons on the Bengal Establishment alone.

worth, that neither their Patron nor society will have cause to regret the liberality of the act.

Page 63. *If the Husband should die, &c.*—This note is best illustrated by a case in point:

"A native of some consequence having travelled from the "Deccan to Muttra was taken ill, and there died. After his "body was burnt a confidential servant carried his effects home "to his widow, who when apprized of the event made a long "and painful journey from the Deccan to Muttra to burn her- "self on the same spot where her husband's body had been burnt. "An officer, versed in the language and customs of the country, "being present endeavoured to induce her to retract her vow "of self-destruction, and being on duty with his corps at that "station offered to protect her from all harm and insult. She "expressed herself sensible of his kindness, but added that the "only favour he could confer on her, would be the offering no "impediment to the ceremony, which she had travelled so great "a distance to perform. She then took leave of a little sister "(a girl about nine years of age) in an affectionate manner, "putting her hand upon her head and blessing her. Taking off "some ornaments from her person she gave them to her friends; "having ascended the pile she placed her late husband's turban "and dagger in her lap, and so with perfect composure sub- "mitted to the flames."

Page 66. *For it is a mistaken notion, &c.*—To prove this let us turn to the Institutes of Menu, the son of Brahma, *who*, we read, *laid down that system of Duties which is revered by such as are learned in the Vedas, and impressed as the means of attaining beatitude on the hearts of the just.* So instructed by this son of Brahma, in respect to the *implicit reverence* due to his Institutes, we cannot err in this our effort to serve the cause of suffering humanity, if we allow ourselves to be directed by them, as the rules or tenets which he has laid down for the guidance of his enthusiastic followers; as in them the duties of children to their parents are most strongly

insisted on; and *as in them* also those duties to the *widowed* mother are most distinctly particularized.

If we look into the second chapter on Education, or on the Sacerdotal and first order, we shall find that

"The student for life must, if his preceptor die, attend on "his son, or *his widow*, or on one of his paternal kinsmen, with "the same respect, which he shewed to the living."

If the widow *should* burn, wherefore this precept? It may be observed that this clause tends to refute the notion that a woman of the Brahminical caste *must* burn; for in the preceding clauses it is premised that

"A pupil who seeks the path to Heaven, should not live to "the end of his days in the dwelling of a preceptor, who is no "Brahmin. If he desire to pass his whole life in the house of "a sacerdotal teacher, he must serve him with assiduous care, "till he be removed from his mortal frame."

In the second chapter on Education, or on the second order, there is a clause on obsequies. To this I refer as explanatory of the woman's request,* as stated in an account of a Suttee, from the *Bengal Hurkaru*.

"Obsequies must not be performed by night, since the night "is called rácshaçi, or infested by demons; nor while the sun "is rising or setting, nor when it has just risen."

It may here be remarked, that if with the burning of the dead the burning of the living was an indispensably religious rite, some allusion to it, some precept connected with it, might in this chapter be reasonably expected to be laid down for his followers' direction or observance. There is not, however, the slightest allusion, nor the most distant hint to such a rite. So far otherwise, an inference that the widow should not destroy herself, though not expressed yet tacitly connected, may be drawn from several ordinances of this legislator, when

* "At this time the woman herself said the sun was fast declining, and begged she might be carried to the pile."—See the Morning Post of the 9th of January.

propounding the immemorial duties of man and woman, *who*, according to his Institutes of Hindu Law, *must both remain firm in the legal path, whether united or* SEPARATED.

In the chapter on private and criminal Law, and on the Commercial Classes, the following enactment for the express protection of females, runs thus—

" Their fathers protect them in childhood—their husbands " protect them in youth—their sons protect them *in old* age."

Another clause, after declaring the father and the husband to be reprehensible in the neglect of their respective duties, concludes with—

" Reprehensible also is the son who protects not his mother " AFTER THE DECEASE of her lord."

In the chapter on diet, purification, and women, the line of conduct to be rigidly observed by *widows*, is in the following terms explicitly laid down.

" A faithful wife who wishes to attain in Heaven the man- " sion of her husband, must do nothing unkind to him be he " living or dead."—" Let her emaciate her body, by living " voluntarily on pure flowers, roots and fruit; but let her not, " when her lord is deceased, even pronounce the name of another " man."—" Let her continue till death forgiving all injuries, " performing harsh duties, avoiding every sensual pleasure, and " cheerfully practising the incomparable rules of virtue, which " have been followed by such women as were devoted to one " only husband."—" Many thousands of Brahmins having avoided " sensuality from their youth, and having left no issue in their " families, have ascended to heaven."—" And like those ab- " stemious men, a virtuous wife ascends to heaven, though she " have no child, if, *after the decease of her lord*, she devote her- " self to pious austerity."—" But a *widow*, who, from a wish " to bear children slights her deceased lord by marrying again, " brings disgrace on herself here below, and shall be excluded " from the seat of her lord."

Here is good ground for a supposition that these penalties, together with the austerity of life prescribed, ope-

rating on the weak and superstitious minds of women addicted to violent passions and enthusiastic notions, have greatly contributed to make them easy, if not willing, victims to the artifices of a crafty priesthood, " *Who* " *creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden* " *with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning and* " *never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*"*

In the preceding part of this chapter on Criminal Law, there is also a clause which ought not to be omitted, as directly bearing on the point in question—

" In childhood must a female be dependent on her father—
" in youth on her husband—*her lord being dead, on her sons*—
" if she have no sons on the near kinsman of her husband—
" if he left no kinsmen, on those of her father—if she have no
" paternal kinsmen, on the Sovereign"—

And in this great cause of humanity, I would no other arbiter than the Sovereign of British India, BY WHOSE ROYAL FIAT, through the representation of a benevolent parliament I humbly hope, in common with THOUSANDS of my countrymen, that the day is not far distant when the murderous rite will be abolished.

The passages already referred to in the Institutes of Menu may be deemed sufficient to shew that by this Hindu Lycurgus Suttees, so far from having been prescribed or enforced in his Ritual, were not even contemplated. And if any proof be required to establish the fact of Suttees not being an exclusively religious rite, solely confined to, and indispensably required of, the Hindu widow—that proof is manifest in the circumstance of a Mahommedan woman† having been allowed to burn, when the widow of

* 2nd Timothy, chap. iii. ver. 6.

† On the death of the late Rajah of Ulvur it was expected that his widow would burn on his funeral pile ; but on the customary interrogations being made as to her intentions, she declined burning with the body. It may be fair to observe that they had not lived on the best terms, the Rajah having placed his affection on a Mahommedan woman, the mother of his child ; who, when the determination of the widow was known to her, volunteered to burn for the honour of the family, and did burn with the body of the

the Hindu Caste refused. In truth, Suttees have alone obtained from immemorial usage, or custom; which from remorseless motives taking its rise has since by corrupt means been encouraged, and for evil purposes is still maintained.* There is a law maxim, *vetustas pro lege semper habetur*, which when we interfere with the national prejudices or customs of another people, ought not to be by us wholly disregarded; and as no government can for any long period be considered safe, *nisi benevolentia munitum*, I am sensible that the hasty adoption of harsh or coercive measures on the part of the local government of India, to put a stop to this long standing practice should be studiously avoided: Nevertheless I am most anxious that those in power should be roused from the apathy which they at present evince, so that they no longer suffer the chief actors in such tragedies, in reprobation of which no language can be sufficiently strong, to escape their most marked displeasure.

Page 68. Read—"That no son, brother, or cousin, "in the first or second degree, of the female so burning, who may be found in anywise aiding or abetting, "shall be permitted to hold any situation, or renew any "leases under the Government. That the same exclusion shall extend to him, whether relative or not, who "shall fire the pile—as also to him who for the same "purpose shall place the torch in the orphan's hand."

Rajah. If a Suttee be, as it has generally been supposed to be, a religious ceremony confined to the Hindoos, such a circumstance could not have taken place.—This fact therefore speaks volumes in support of what I have ventured to advance.

* "The following day I learnt she had three brothers, the two elder of "whom had persuaded her to become a Suttee in order to lay hold of about "3,500 rupees: the younger of the three told his master, a gentleman of "my acquaintance, the above fact, and said her money was the only wish "or object they could have in view, as many others in the family never "wished to become Suttees, and one of her own Caste assisted in dissuading her from mounting the pile."—Letter from Jaunpore, in the Morning Herald of March 5.

Had some such enactment as this been put forth by the local Government, the Bishop from the dignity of his office and the Chief Justice from his high legal authority appearing as parties in its promulgation, much time would have been saved, and some good might ere this have been effected : Far different indeed would have been the result of the writer's humane exertions,* and one murder less would have been added to the catalogue of our National Crimes. If in meeting this crying evil, as it ought to be met by a nation professing the mild doctrines of Christianity, there should be still found in the quarter most concerned a leaning to further procrastination, it is to be hoped that the wishes of thousands will induce Parliament to take the matter into their deliberation, so that these murderous rites, or rather these legalized murders,† may for the honour of our country be abolished.

Page 75. *In order, however, to place the Ecclesiastical Establishment of India in such a state of respectable independence as should enlarge the sphere of action in the propagation of the Gospel, &c.*—Before I proceed to the ill effects of permitting an arbitrary invasion on the just rights and fair expectations of the Clergy, the anomaly in the present establishment of the Cathedral of Calcutta claims some attention. To the spontaneous gift of a Hindoo we are indebted for the ground on which that cathedral stands ; to the liberality of the British community in India the erection of that sacred pile is mainly attributable ; and when the little cost the beautiful structure has actually been to the Indian Government, it is the paramount duty of that Government to place its revenue in a state of respectable independence by a SUITABLE EN-

* See Extract from the Bengal Hurkaru, in the Morning Post of the 9th of January.

† It may be here right to observe, that no Suttee can take place without a license or permission being primarily obtained from the civil authority.

DOWMENT; so that the pitiful mode of applying on every trifling occasion for pecuniary assistance to Government, or their recurring to the no less pitiful mode of granting the same by the aid of lotteries, (as has been heretofore the case,) be for the future altogether needless. To this end I would suggest that a Chapter be formed and made a Corporate Body, which should be vested with powers to receive donations, bequests of land, &c. and to hold the same without reference to the Company's standing orders on this head. In fact that they should be empowered to act as a Corporate Body in reference to temporalities without those restrictions which the Company impose upon Europeans under their present impolitic regulations. If there be any objection, which there cannot possibly be on any reasonable ground, to the two Chaplains of the Cathedral being termed Dean and Sub-Dean, instead of the anomalous denominations of *Senior Presidency* and *Junior Presidency* Chaplains; yet no reasonable objection to the proposed formation of a Chapter, can possibly be made, as there can be a Chapter efficient for all required purposes without a Dean, as in the Church of Southwel;* or in the absence of the Bishop the Arch-deacon might preside as in the Chapter of Llandaff.† There can also be no reasonable objection to the beautiful church at Madras being a Cathedral with a Chapter, as a Bishop can have two Chapters.‡ The Chapters should be corporate bodies for the purpose of receiving grants of land or monies by bequests or donations, to be strictly applied

* There may be a Chapter without any Dean; as the Chapter of the Collegiate Church of Southwel: and grants by or to them are as effectual as other grants by Dean and Chapter.—*Wats.* c. 38.

† In the Cathedral Churches of St. David's and Llandaff there never hath been any Dean, but the Bishop in either is head of the Chapter: and at the former the Chantor, at the latter the Archdeacon presides in the absence of the Bishop or vacancy of the See.—*Johns.* 60.

‡ One Bishop may possibly have two Chapters, and that by union or consolidation.—*God.* 58. *Burn's Ecclesiastical Law.*

to the sole use of the Church or the benefit of the poor. And in order to avoid litigation and to have those funds securely placed, I would suggest the propriety of having the Company's Advocate General, the Civil Auditor General, and the Treasurer for the time being, nominated as lay members of the Chapter; and thus, while the Bishop and Clergy of the Cathedral should have the sole direction of the spiritualities of the Church, these lay members in conjunction with the Bishop and Clergy should have the management of her temporalities; so that any surplus, which might be spared after the annual audit of accounts, should *bona fide* be set apart for the exclusive service of the poor and indigent.

If a second Bishop should be appointed to the eastward of the Cape, and Bombay become a part of that prelate's diocese, a corporate Chapter for the same desirable purposes should be formed at that Presidency. And if I might be allowed to hazard an opinion from the bequests and donations that were made in favour of the poor while I was a member and president of the select vestry, I do not hesitate to express a firm belief that the beneficial effects of such an arrangement would exceed general expectation, and give universal satisfaction.

In support of what has been already noticed in the preceding pages* regarding a late infringement on the Chaplains' Rights in respect to Furlough, it may be remarked, that the very term *Furlough* implies or comprises that, which of itself secures to the individual a continuance of his Rights and Privileges during his temporary absence from duty. It may be also observed that in all cases at home, while leave of absence is granted by the controling power in every department of the State, the Absentee, whether Civil or Military, enjoys the full advantage of his rank and situation; and the same observation in reference to leave of absence in the case of the Clergy of India, may

* Pages 26 to 29.

be forcibly applied in reference to those incumbents, who though absent by the dispensing power of their diocesans are still virtually the Clergy of the Diocese, in which their respective preferments lie: Any Chaplain therefore being absent on Furlough with the sanction of the Bishop, cannot but be fairly considered, at least as far as regards his rank and interest, as virtually one of the resident Clergy, according to the spirit if not to the letter of the Bishop's Patent; consequently any supersession on such grounds is as unjust, and oppressive as it is impolitic. In respect to the impolicy of supersession I would aver that superseding valuable and old servants in the vineyard would have been unjust had even those supersessions been confined to the Presidencies, where the Archdeaconries became vacant: But when Juniors in the Service are taken from one Presidency and placed over the heads of all the Clergy at another, no words can palliate such an infringement on the rights and privileges of deserving men; nor can language justify such unjust and impolitic measures. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* is an adage, in the propriety of which every sensitive mind will readily acquiesce; but, as I have before had occasion to remark, *nil nisi verum* is a better reading where the interests of our Indian Church, and the just rights of her Ministers, are placed at the mercy of any individual; for the greater the worth of that individual may be, the greater will be the mischief. This has been fully exemplified in the conduct of that most amiable Prelate, the lamented Bishop Heber; in whose mind were congregated all the virtues that adorn private life, among which perhaps *simplicitas ac liberalitas* were pre-eminent: But these virtues, like all others, *nisi adsit modus, in exitium vertunter.* So unassuming, and so unpretending was Bishop Heber, that instead of exercising that authority which his talents and rank entitled him to assume, he was generally too much inclined to listen to the suggestions of others: And this the more

readily, as he always gave full credit to others for the same honesty of intention, by which he himself was guided in his every act. It may truly be said of him, that

> " Suspicion slept
> " At Wisdom's gate, and to Simplicity
> " Resigned her charge."

Can it then be a matter of wonder that Bishop James should have followed such an example; and, unintentionally it may be presumed, have fallen into the same error. The injustice of placing a Junior Chaplain from one Presidency over the whole of the Clergy of another, can only be surpassed by the impolicy of the measure. It may so happen, unfortunately for the credit of the Church, that a Senior Chaplain might be deemed unfit for, or unworthy of, promotion; but can it ever be supposed that the whole body of Chaplains at any one Presidency would be equally unqualified to fill a vacant Archdeaconry, or equally deserving supersession? Such a supposition would be no less uncharitable than it would be unwarrantable: Besides the Archdeaconries of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, are not to be assimilated to each other in the same ratio, that Archdeaconries in the United Kingdom, or even in the Colonies, bear to each other. It should ever be recollected that the language, manners, customs, and prejudices of the three Presidencies differ widely from each other; and to this are the Company so much alive, that they will not allow the Civil or Military servants of either Presidency to exchange with each other; nor will they on any pretence whatever permit a transfer of their servants from one Presidency to another. When on the death of Archdeacon Moseley a vacancy occurred at Madras, Bishop Middleton nominated the Senior Chaplain at that Presidency to the vacant situation: And if Bishop Heber's valuable life had been spared, there is no reason to doubt but that he would have acted on future occasions no less justly. When therefore such

a man as Bishop Heber should have been so sadly misled as to invade the rights of the Chaplains, it is highly important that something should be done to protect those rights from future invasion: And the Prelate, who is now on the eve of sailing, if his Lordship were to consult the interests of the Church, and his own peace of mind, would most readily forego the power of acting unjustly: By placing it out of his own power, and hence that of his successors, to supersede old and deserving Chaplains, he would secure the esteem, the confidence, and affectionate regard of his Clergy, and effectually put an end to all jealousies and undermining attempts to supplant each other, through the agency of patronage. But if the being feared to the being loved be a matter of no consequence, or of a secondary consideration, so that the Bishop possess an uncontrollable power over the rights and privileges of the Chaplains—if towards that end, such supersessions as have already obtained are still to be permitted, a most grievous injury is not only done to the Senior Chaplains at each Presidency, but *to the Service at large;* for as far as it concerns the rest of the Chaplains, I would ask, where is the spur to future exertions? Where is the reward for past services, without a fair and honourable right to promotion? In regard to the Senior as the individual most seriously affected by such supersessions, if he have not merited promotion in that service, in which he must have passed the greater part of his life, how can he expect, or on what grounds can he hope for any preferment at home on his retirement? To his native country he returns as it were a stranger; and from the very suspicion of his appearing to have been undeserving of that promotion, to which he was justly entitled by seniority, a barrier is raised against those reasonable expectations which he may have fondly entertained, and all his hopes are blighted.

The necessity therefore of securing to the Clergy their rights and privileges inviolate, both policy and justice strongly enforce; for if the system, which has been already acted upon too long, be still continued, what man of the most ordinary abilities, or of the most moderate expectations of Preferment, who *ad interim* can undergo the personal fatigue of serving two or three distant curacies, will traverse 16,000 miles of sea, leaving behind him his friends and family connexions, to engage *in a service*, in which, however great may be his zeal and application, and notwithstanding unanswerable Testimonials, he would be thus liable to a disgraceful Supersession—*in which* he would be thus excluded from those honours of his profession, to which every man of correct feeling naturally aspires, and whereby results that energy of mind and body so productive of good: From the deprivation of such stimulus there arises, to a certain degree, that inertness of action, whence not one thought is exerted—not one effort made, beyond the cold performance of those duties, which are strictly prescribed to the office occupied.

Not that I would for a moment appear to be advocating that Seniority constituted a *positive claim;* for unless it be supported by correctness of conduct, sufficient ability for the due discharge of the superior station, and manifest zeal in the great cause of the profession, I think it does not: but when so supported, I boldly do avow, that it does possess *such positive claim;* and I would gladly abide by the impartial decision of the question, by those my Superiors, were the case their own.

It has in the preceding pages been advanced that the Native is governed by appearances. If then he saw the Minister of Christ's Church in India regularly promoted to the higher situations in that Church, he would be led to perceive that the high authorities at home respected that Priesthood, and in them placed a confidence: This

would naturally lead the Native to place also a confidence in what they taught; and hence a favourable conclusion may be drawn in the work of conversion. But while the Native sees the door of preferment barred against the Chaplains—when they on every vacancy see a Bishop arrive and act so diametrically opposite to their own notions in regard to their own Priests, by *to-them-unaccountable* supersessions, they can entertain but very little respect for our Clergy: And if they have little or no respect for the Teachers of a *to-them-novel* doctrine, how can we, humanly speaking, in common sense expect them to embrace THOSE GREAT TRUTHS, which that doctrine inculcates.

Having courted the opinions of those best qualified to form correct notions on India affairs, and having in no one instance received an opinion that can be considered adverse to the measures herein suggested (excepting that arising from a doubt as to a second Bishop being found capable of undergoing such fatigue), I cannot but encourage the hope of seeing the great and important object of these Suggestions brought into operation; whereby the advancement of the TRUE FAITH, and the propagation of the GOSPEL OF CHRIST throughout our wide-spread Possessions in the East might, under the blessing of ALMIGHTY GOD, be confidently expected.

H. S.

Langley, Colnbrook,
June 1st, 1829.

Printed by A. Hancock, Middle Row Place, Holborn.

A PLAIN

STATEMENT

AND

SCRIPTURAL DEFENCE

OF

THE LEADING DOCTRINES OF UNITARIANISM:

TO WHICH ARE ADDED

Remarks

ON THE CANONICAL AUTHORITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND A CANDID REVIEW OF THE TEXT OF THE IMPROVED VERSION,

In a Letter to a Friend;

BY ROBERT WALLACE,

Minister of a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters in Chesterfield.

——— Juvat integros accedere fontes,
Atque haurire. LUCRETIUS.

CHESTERFIELD:

Printed for the Author; and sold by T. Woodhead:

SOLD ALSO BY LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME & BROWNE; AND BY SHERWOOD, NEELY & JONES, PATERNOSTER-ROW, LONDON.

1819.

CONTENTS.

Introductory Remarks. (5—7.) Three subjects proposed for discussion. I. *Statement of the peculiar doctrines of Unitarianism.* (7.) Unitarians divided into three classes. 1st. Unitarians in the strictest sense. 2ndly. Socinians. 3rdly. Arians. (7—9.) Explanation of the terms Unitarian and Unitarian Christian. (9, 10.) II. *Scriptural authorities on which the peculiar doctrines of Unitarians are founded.* (11.) Scriptural proof that there is only one God: (11—14.) and that the Father only is the true God. (14—16.) Scriptural proof of the Simple Humanity of Jesus Christ, and his Inferiority to the Father. (16—31.) Scriptural proof that the Holy Spirit is not an Intelligent Being distinct from God the Father. (31—40.) III. *Grounds of difference between the Canon and Text adopted by the Editors of the Improved Version and those of the Received Translation.* (40.) 1st. Canon of the New Testament. (40—45.) Books received by the Apostolical Fathers. (45—48.) Canon of the early Syrian Christians. (48—50.) Canon of Origen and the Church at Alexandria. (50—53.) Canon of Eusebius. (53—58.) Canon of the Improved Version. (58—62.) 2ndly. Text of the New Testament. (62.) Autographs of the Sacred Writers, Greek MSS. and Latin Versions. (63, 64.) Early printed Editions of the Greek New Testament: Erasmus, Ximenes, Stephens, Beza and the Elzevirs. (65.) Later Editions: Mill, Kuster, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Alter, Matthai and Birch. (66—69.) Griesbach's second edition. (69—72.) Text of the Improved Version. (72, 73.) Principal deviations from the second edition of Griesbach. Mat. xxiii. 14.

John i. 14—18. (74.) John xix. 4. xx. 8. (75.) Rom. iii. 25. (76—80.) 1 Cor. x. 9. xv. 47. (81.) Text of Griesbach compared with that of the Received Translation in Acts xx. 28. Eph. iii. 9. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 John iii. 16. v. 7, 8. (82—85.) Passages retained by the Editors of the Improved Version, but printed in the Italic character to signify that they are of doubtful authority. (86.) Objections to the Introductory Chapters of Matthew and Luke. (86—106.) Christ's agony; Luke xxii. 42, 43. (106—108.) Address to the thief upon the cross: Luke xxiii. 43. (108—110.) Healing qualities of the pool of Bethesda: John v. 4. (110—112.) Story of the Woman taken in Adultery: John vii. 53—viii. 11. (112—125.) 2 Peter ii. (125—127.) Conclusion.

ERRATA.

P. 47. l. 22. after 'not' supply 'without hesitation.'
P. 61. l. 3. erase the word 'any.'
P. 94. l. 21. for 'even' r. 'ever.'
P. 106. l. 25. for 'anthority,' r. 'authority.'

A PLAIN

STATEMENT

AND

SCRIPTURAL DEFENCE

OF THE LEADING

Doctrines of Unitarianism, &c.

My Dear Friend,

YOUR wish to obtain a more exact acquaintance with the doctrines of Unitarianism, proves that, though naturally enough attached to the principles in which you were educated, you are not a bigot or a slave to them. You might have satisfied yourself, like many others, with the misrepresentations of our adversaries: you might have taken for granted, without further inquiry, the truth of the charges usually alleged against us: you might have been induced to brand us with opprobrious epithets, and "cast out our names as evil;" and at the same time have thought that, by acting thus, you

were "doing God service." But you have pursued your object by a far different path, and one which I hope will have a more desirable termination, whatever may be the result as to your opinion respecting the doctrines of which it is my lot to be the humble apologist and advocate.

Like the primitive disciples of our common Lord, we are "a sect every where spoken against;" all having something or other to advance in opposition to the principles which hold us together as a body of Christians. One charges us with a want of faith; and another with a want of feeling. One taxes us with levity; and another blames us for our coldness and indifference. But happily our moral conduct is still above suspicion. We yield to none in a zeal for that "pure and undefiled religion" of which the apostle James has drawn so warm and animated a picture; and amidst the various misrepresentations to which our character and opinions have been exposed, our moral principles, we rejoice to think, have never been obscured for a moment, by the shadow of an insinuation. Of the futility of many of the charges usually alleged against us, you are already in part convinced. To complete and

strengthen that conviction is the principal object of the following remarks.

The inquiries which you have made relate, *first*, to the peculiarities of opinion by which Unitarians are distinguished; *secondly*, to the Scriptural authority on which those peculiarities are founded; and *thirdly*, to the difference between the Canon and Text adopted by the editors of the Improved Version, and those of the authorised translation, together with the grounds of that difference. In replying to them I shall unfold my sentiments with all candour and freedom; and may that Being who overrules the deliberations of all his creatures to the wisest and best ends, crown the attempt with his blessing.

STATEMENT OF THE PECULIAR DOCTRINES OF UNITARIANS.

UNITARIANS are divided into three classes, distinguishable from each other by the opinions which they entertain respecting the dignity and pre-existence of Christ.

1. Those to whom the epithet *Unitarian* may be applied in the strictest sense, are such as

withhold from Jesus all divine honours, and direct their prayers and addresses exclusively to the Father. They believe in the sole, entire, and incommunicable divinity of God; deny the personal existence of the Holy Spirit; and regard Jesus as strictly and properly a human being, fashioned in all respects like unto his brethren, though the most complete character ever exhibited to the world.

2. Those who are called *Socinians* differ from the preceding class of Unitarians in offering up adoration to Christ. They believe that, though originally a man, he is now become, by the express appointment of the Father, an object of invocation and worship: and hence arises the impropriety of using indiscriminately the terms Socinian and Unitarian. *Unitarian* has a general meaning, and stands opposed to Trinitarian. *Socinian* has a specific meaning, and denotes one of a particular class of Unitarians.

The term *Socinian* is derived from *Socinus*, the most conspicuous among the Polish Unitarians of the sixteenth century. On the first appearance of Unitarianism in England, its advocates were called *Socinians;* and, as their doctrines were then unpopular, *Socinian* became

a general term of reproach, and was applied to all whose opinions deviated from the regular standard of orthodoxy. Penn and Tillotson incurred the charge of *Socinianism* on account of their liberality; and in the days of Andrew Marvel, to use his own concise and emphatical remark, "no man could tell you the truth, but he must presently be deemed a Socinian."*

3. A third class of Unitarians comprises such as believe in the pre-existence of Christ. These, however, are more frequently known by the name of *Arians*. They are so called from *Arius*, who published his opinions at the beginning of the fourth century. They deny the existence of three persons in the divine nature, but maintain generally, that the soul which animated the body of Christ was a pre-existent spirit, formed out of nothing; and, under God, the maker of angels, archangels, thrones, principalities, and powers; the whole hierarchy of heaven, and all material nature.

Hence, then, it appears, *first*, that the term Unitarian has respect only to the opinions of those who believe in the undivided Unity of the

---

* Rehearsal Transprosed, Pt. ii. pp. 339, 340, 12mo. 1765.

Deity; and that no one can, in strictness of language, be called a Unitarian, who believes in the existence of two, or three, or more persons in the Godhead; whether those persons are defined to be subsistences or attributes; distinct intelligent beings, or mere relations; divine essences distinguished by a certain personal property, or positive modes of being, ultimately terminating and filling a substantial nature.*

It appears, *secondly*, from the above classification, that Unitarian Christians may differ in opinion respecting the dignity of Jesus Christ, and the time at which his existence commenced; but that all must admit his inferiority and subjection to the Father. "The discussion of Unitarianism," says an eloquent and forcible writer, "has been much embarrassed, and its cause injured, by its being mixed up with the private opinions of its friends. There is gross mistake, or wilful injustice, in reckoning whatever is held by certain Unitarians essential to Unitarianism itself. The humanity of Christ is

---

* The above is a brief enumeration of a few of the senses in which the doctrine of three persons in one God, has been at different times explained by its advocates.—See "A Sermon preached at Oldbury, June 20, 1816, before the Unitarian Tract Society for Warwickshire and the neighbouring Counties, by John Small." p. 14. 12mo. Hunter.

not essential to Unitarianism. Although differing from most respectable authority, I have no hesitation in deeming such limitation most improper. It is inconsistent with the etymology and meaning of the term, and its historical use. Dr. Price was an Unitarian as well as Dr. Priestley: so is every worshipper of the Father only, whether he believe that Christ was created before all worlds, or first existed when born of Mary."*

SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITIES ON WHICH THE PECULIAR DOCTRINES OF UNITARIANS ARE FOUNDED.

Scriptural Proof that there is only one God.

THE doctrine of the Divine Unity is founded on the general tenour of Scriptural language, in which it is repeatedly and forcibly inculcated; and in this respect it differs essentially from that of the Trinity, which is not expressly taught in a single passage of Scripture, if we except 1. John v. 7., upon which the writings of Porson and Marsh have stamped the decisive character of forgery. To prove the truth of the former part

* Fox's "Lectures on Subjects connected with the Corruption, Revival, and Future Influence of Genuine Christianity." p. 91. 8vo. Hunter.

of this assertion, the following passages may be adduced. "*Hear, O Israel,* the *Lord* our *God* is *one Lord.*" Deut. vi. 4.—"There is none holy as the *Lord:* for there is none beside thee: neither is there any rock like our *God.*" i. Sam. ii. 2.—"For thou art great, and doest wondrous things: thou art *God alone.*" Ps. lxxxvi. 10.—"Thus saith the Lord—I am the first, and I am the last; and *beside me* there is *no God.*" Is. xliv. 6.—"I am the *Lord* and there is *none else;* there is *no God beside me:* I girded thee, though thou hast not known me: that they may know from the rising of the sun and from the west, that there is *none beside me.* I am the *Lord* and there is *none else.*" Is. xlv. 5, 6. See also vs. 14, 18, 21.—"I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." vs. 23.—"The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; the *Lord* our *God* is *one Lord:* and thou shalt love the *Lord* thy *God* with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment." Mark xii. 29, 30.—"And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is *one God;* and there is *none other* but he." vs. 32.—"We know that an idol

is nothing in the world, and that there is *none other God but one.*" 1 Cor. viii. 4.—"*God is one.*" Gal. iii. 20.—"Thou believest that there is *one God;* thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble." James ii. 19. Passages like these admit properly but of one interpretation; and yet the ingenuity of criticism has invented other senses as remote as possible from their natural and obvious meaning. "Every text which affirms the divine Unity," says the Rev. R. Wardlaw, a writer of orthodox celebrity, "must be interpreted as meaning that God is *one* indeed—but one, *according to the peculiar modification of Unity which belongs to Deity;*"—and hence he infers, in consistency with this favourite principle of interpretation, that "every text which affirms the Unity of God, involves an affirmation of the Trinity."* It is in vain that the Unitarian adduces his proofs by hundreds and thousands. His adversary, with this happy principle of inter-

---

* Unit. Incap. of Vind. p. 303.—"*Meyer,* who wrote a book *De Mysterio Sacro Sanctæ Trinitatis ex solius veteris Testamenti Libris demonstrato,* urges as the text which is the most clear and conclusive of all, Deut. vi. 4. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord:' in which he is not at all singular, (says Jortin,) many of his cabalistic brethren having made the same remark on the same text. The famous *Postellus* observed, that there were eleven thousand proofs of the Trinity in the Old Testament interpreted rightly, that is, etymologico-mystico-cabalistically."—Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. iii. p. 100.

pretation at hand, can instantly disarm them of all their force, however numerous and explicit; for, by this grand secret of the polemical art, he is enabled to assign a variety of new senses to the term Unity, and instead of regarding the Deity as strictly and numerically one, he may regard him as one in three or any indefinite number of persons.

Scriptural Proof that the Father only is the true God.

SINCE, then, the Unity of the Deity is not limited to any particular subject in the above passages, let us proceed to the enumeration of such as absolutely restrict and appropriate it to *the Father*. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship *the Father* in spirit and in truth: for *the Father* seeketh such to worship him. GOD is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv. 23, 24.—"And this is life eternal, that they might know *thee the only true* GOD, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 3.—"Grace be unto you, and peace, from GOD our *Father*, and from our Lord

Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. i. 3.—"Though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) yet to us there is but *one* GOD, *the Father*, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.—"*One* GOD *and Father* of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. iv. 6.—"For there is *one* GOD, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. No comment is required to elucidate passages like these. They speak a language which sophistry itself is unable to pervert, and confine the Godhead solely and exclusively to the person of *the Father*. I shall content myself, therefore, with adopting, by way of conclusion to this part of my subject, the words of a writer who is quoted by Mr. Christie in his excellent Discourses on the Divine Unity. "Upon a strict inquiry," says this writer, "it appears that the word GOD occurs in the sacred books of the New Testament twelve hundred and eighty-eight times; and that there are several hundred texts wherein the *Father* is styled GOD absolutely, by way of eminence, it being impossible by the construction itself, that it should have any other sense.—There is not one text wherein the word GOD necessarily sig-

nifies more persons than one. There is not one text wherein we are obliged to understand it of three persons; the sacred writers not having afforded us the least plausible pretence or colour for any such sense."

Scriptural Proof of the Simple Humanity of Jesus Christ, and of his Inferiority to the Father.

HAVING adduced passages to establish *the sole Deity of the Father*, the next object of the Unitarian is to confirm, by a similar train of evidence, *the inferiority and subordination of the son.*

With this view he has recourse to such passages as the following. "There came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, *Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one,* that is, GOD." Mark x. 17, 18.—"If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for *my Father is greater than I.*" John xiv. 28.—"Ye are Christ's and *Christ is*

GOD's." 1 Cor. iii. 23.—"I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and *the head of Christ is* GOD." 1 Cor. xi. 3.

He appeals, likewise, to other passages where Jesus is styled *the servant of* GOD, and where his wisdom and power are said to have been derived from the Father. "Behold *my servant* whom I have chosen; my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased."* Mat. xii. 18.—"When ye have lifted up the son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that *I do nothing of myself;* but, as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." John viii. 28.—"For *I have not spoken of myself;* but *the Father* which sent me, *he gave me a commandment* what I should say, and what I should speak: And I know that his commandment is life everlasting. Whatsoever I speak, therefore, *even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak.*" John xii. 49,

---

* It would have been more conformable to the usual style of Luke the most classical of all the Evangelical writers, if, instead of *son* and *child*, the word *servant* had been adopted in the following passages, by King James's Translators. "The God of our fathers hath glorified his *son* Jesus." Acts iii. 13.—"God having raised up his *son* Jesus." vs. 26.—"Against thy holy *child* Jesus." iv. 27.—"That signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy *child* Jesus." vs. 30.—See Luke i. 54, 69. vii. 7. and xii. 45.

50.—" Now they have known that *all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee.* For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me." John xvii. 7, 8.—" *The son can do nothing of himself.*" John v. 19.—" *I can of mine own self do nothing;* as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." vs. 30.—" *The works which the Father hath given me to finish, bear witness of me,* that the Father hath sent me." vs. 36.—" Then cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up the Kingdom to* GOD, *even the Father*; when he shall have *put down all rule,* and *all authority* and *power.* And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall *the son* also *himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that* GOD *may be all in all.*" 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

Passages equally apposite and decisive are adduced by the Unitarian as proofs of Christ's humanity, in which he is said to have been *chosen, appointed, sanctified, inspired, anointed, given* and *sent* by GOD. " Behold my servant whom I have *chosen.*" Mat. xii. 18.—" Who was

faithful to him that *appointed* him." Heb. iii. 2.—"Him whom the Father hath *sanctified*." John x. 36.—"I will *put my spirit upon him*." Mat. xii. 18.—"Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath *anointed* thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Heb. i. 9. See also Acts x. 38.—"God so loved the world that he *gave* his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16.—"As thou hast *sent* me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." John xvii. 18.

If these references are deemed insufficient to establish the point in question, let the advocates of a more orthodox system consult the following passages, in which Jesus is repeatedly and emphatically called A MAN, and evidently regarded as such by those who associated and conversed with him. "And again he denied with an oath, saying, I do not know *the man*." Mat. xxvi. 72.—"When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether *the man* were a Galilean." Luke xxiii. 6.—"And when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, certainly *this* was a righteous *man*." vs. 47.—"But now ye seek to kill me, *a man* that hath told you the truth." John viii.

40.—"*A man* that is called Jesus, made clay and anointed mine eyes." ix. 11.—"Jesus of Nazareth, *a man* approved of God among you by miracles and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you." Act ii. 22.—"Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that man* whom he hath ordained." xvii. 31.—"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, *the man* Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. See also John i. 30. vii. 46. x. 33. xviii. 17. Rom. v. 15. 1 Cor. xv. 21.

As a further confirmation of the proper humanity of Christ the Unitarian appeals to various texts of Scripture, where he is said to have been *born* into the world like other men; to have undergone the regular discipline *of a child;* to have been subject to the feelings of *joy* and *sorrow*, *love* and *anger;* to have undergone *temptation;* to have felt the pains of *hunger* and *thirst;* and to have *suffered* and *died* like other men. "To this end was I *born*, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." John xviii. 37.—"Is not this *the Carpenter*, the son of Mary?" Mark vi. 3.—"And the Jews marvelled, saying, *How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?*"

John vii. 15.—"In that hour Jesus *rejoiced* in spirit." Luke x. 21.—"Jesus *wept*." John xi. 35.—"Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus *loved* following." John xxi. 20.—"And when he had looked round about on them with *anger*—he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand." Mark iii. 5.—"And he was in the wilderness forty days, *tempted* by Satan." i. 13.—"And in those days he did *eat* nothing; and when they were ended, he afterward *hungered*." Luke iv, 2.—"Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished—saith *I thirst*." John xix. 28.—"Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding *sorrowful*, even unto death." Mat. xxvi. 38.—"And *being in an agony* he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." Luke xxii. 44.—"And when he had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he *gave up the ghost*." xxiii. 46.

The Unitarian, moreover, infers the superiority of the Father from various passages in which he is literally and emphatically styled the God of Jesus. "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, *My* God, *my* God,

why hast thou forsaken me?" Mat. xxvii. 46.—See also Mark xv. 34.—"Go to my brethren, and say unto them I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to *my* God, and your God." John xx. 17.—"The God and Father *of our Lord Jesus Christ*, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not." 2 Cor. xi. 31.—See also Eph. i. 3. Col. i. 3. 1 Pet. i. 3.—"I cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers, that *the* God *of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him." Eph. i. 16, 17.

Such is the Scriptural basis on which the Unitarian grounds his belief of Christ's humanity; and his adversary admits, without reluctance or hesitation, its consistency with the genuine doctrines of the New Testament. But the admission amounts in fact to nothing, for he maintains at the same time that Jesus was perfect God as well as perfect man; the most exalted, and yet the most frail and dependent of all beings. "He believes," as Lord Bacon, with characteristic force and acuteness, observes, "three to be one, and one to be three; a father not to be older than his son; a son to be equal with his father; and one proceeding from both

to be equal to both; as believing three persons in one nature, and two natures in one person. He believes a virgin to be the mother of a son; and that very son of hers to be her maker. He believes *him* to have been shut up in a narrow cell, whom heaven and earth could not contain. He believes *him* to have been born in time, who was and is from everlasting. He believes *him* to have been a weak child, and carried in arms, who is almighty; and *him* once to have died who alone has life and immortality."* Self-complacent, happy Christian! Continue in the full and free enjoyment of opinions like these, so long as they are capable of yielding thee solid comfort and lasting satisfaction; but blame not him who now addresses thee if his faith is less pliant, and his creed less comprehensive than thine. Far, indeed, be it from me, my dear Friend, to detract from the merits, or asperse the character of Jesus. God is my witness that I receive his precepts and bow to his authority with all due humility and reverence; that I accept his offered terms of salvation with devout gratitude and thankfulness; and that I am willing to embrace his doctrines as a revelation of the counsels of heaven, involving in them my

---

* Works, 4to. vol. iii. p. 129.

best, my dearest, my eternal interests. If, then, with a holy emulation I strive to resemble him in spirit, and in the excellences of his character:—if I approach the throne of my heavenly Father in his name, and aspire to be accepted of him as his faithful, sincere and consistent disciple:—if I am careful to perform my duty as a man and a Christian, neither abusing the privileges which I enjoy, nor blaspheming that worthy name by which I am called:—shall any one dare to impugn my principles, or blame the scantiness of my creed? Forbid it truth and equity!—Forbid it candour, humility and every Christian virtue!

But let us now pursue, for a moment, the consequences of that system which exalts Jesus to an equality with the Father. If his nature had been essentially and truly divine, could it, think you, with any shew of reason, have been said of him that he was *chosen* to be *a servant* of God, and *anointed* by him to preach the gospel? Can you imagine that he would have been spoken of as A MAN *approved of* GOD by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him? Is it probable that he would have been subjected to the pains and sufferings, the trials and infirmities of frail humanity? And would his conduct have

been exhibited to us by writers acquainted with the astonishing fact that he was very and eternal God, as a pattern proper for our imitation? Are we not expressly told that "in all things it behoved him to be *made like unto his brethren*, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people?" Heb. ii. 17. Whence, then, let me ask, this imperious necessity, if the doctrine in question forms any part of genuine Christianity? Could not our salvation have been accomplished but by the condescension and humiliation of Deity itself? Could not man have been reconciled to his maker but by the crucifixion and death of the eternal judge of all the earth? This may be the Christianity of Athanasius, of Calvin, and of numbers besides whom fashion or prejudice has moulded into a conformity with their sentiments: but, be assured, it is not the Christianity of the New Testament;—it is not the Christianity of Matthew or of John, of Peter or of Paul. If Christ, indeed, were every thing which orthodoxy represents him, I should be glad to learn, in what the efficacy of his example would consist? Peter has declared that, when Jesus suffered, he left us an example which we should do well to follow; 1 Pet. ii. 21. and I cannot

think that he meant to insult our feelings, or mock our hopes, when he made that encouraging declaration. Let it be admitted, however, that Jesus was, in all respects, equal to the Father, and you put into the mouth of the apostle words without meaning:—you lay down a rule of conduct, which is, in the nature of things, utterly incapable of application. On this supposition we might, it is true, admire the virtues which distinguished his character, and reflect upon them with feelings of veneration and awe; but a perfect example of human virtue would still be wanting. We could not possibly place ourselves in the situation of one whose nature was so far superior to our own; and must ever despair of successfully imitating a character so exalted, and so divine.*

I would observe further, however, that it is in reference to the strict and proper humanity

---

* In reflecting on the orthodox system concerning the divine nature of Christ, I have often been struck with the propriety of an observation which Johnson has made upon "the plan of Paradise Lost," and which will apply at least with equal force to the subject before us. Had Jesus been possessed of such a nature, his life, as it appears to me, would have "comprised neither human actions nor human manners. We should have found no transactions in which *we* could have been engaged; beheld no condition in which *we* could, by any effort of imagination, have placed ourselves; and should therefore have had little natural curiosity or sympathy."—See Johnson's Life of Milton.

of Jesus, that we view him seated at the right hand of the Father. For if he was only exalted to a state of dignity which he had enjoyed before his appearance in the flesh, and was invested with honours which he had voluntarily laid aside, and could at any time resume; his followers, it is manifest, would have derived from his example but little encouragement to a life of persevering holiness. His ascension into heaven, and reception at the right hand of God, would have been attended with no beneficial effect upon their conduct, had they not embraced the conviction that his piety and virtue were the result of human efforts, aided by the divine blessing, and his exaltation the object and the reward of his unceasing fidelity. If, therefore, God has raised Jesus to a state of peculiar eminence, and "given him a name, which is above every name;" be it remembered that it is only because he first "humbled himself, and became obedient unto death:" and if that exemplary obedience which he manifested should constrain every tongue to "acknowledge that he is Lord," let the acknowledgment be made in the name and "to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 8, 11.

Looking, then, at the general tenour of the Gospel history, as well as the history and writ-

ings of the apostles, what do we find to countenance the doctrines of Christ's Proper Deity and Equality with the Father? Nothing,—literally nothing, but a few false readings and mistranslations, with a passage here and there, which, by remote inferences and far fetched analogies, is made to speak a language favourable to these doctrines. The Gospel of John has, indeed, been considered as an exception to this statement, by many with whom I have occasionally conversed upon this subject; and who have been otherwise disposed to think favourably of the Scriptural arguments for the doctrines of Unitarianism. But the passages, it should be recollected, which appear to give most strength to this opinion, are directly opposed to the general tenour of the gospel, and the express assertions of our Lord himself. Besides, the Evangelist, in assigning his own motives for the composition of his Gospel, makes no allusion whatever to the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity. He professes, on the other hand, to have written it with a view to confirm the testimony of the other Evangelists, that he was a great prophet, sent to teach mankind the way of eternal life. "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that ye might

believe that Jesus is the Christ, *the* SON *of* GOD, and that, believing, ye might have life in his name." xx. 30, 31. Here we have the Evangelist's own statement of the motives which induced him to write his gospel; and it is a statement of the most explicit and satisfactory nature. He does not tell his readers that, because men had been led to entertain erroneous notions of the person and character of Jesus, he had thought fit to state facts within the compass of his own knowledge which would restore to him the dignity and pre-eminence of which he had been divested. He merely professes to relate a few of the incidents in his life which have a tendency to confirm the truth of his mission; and which, but for the fondness and partiality of friendship, might have been buried in oblivion, and for ever lost to the investigations and researches of mankind. Other facts of the same interesting nature, he tells us, might have been recorded; but these he thinks sufficient to answer the object which he had in view. Are we, then, to credit his own declaration, or trust to the vague and idle conjectures of others? Did he write to prove that Jesus was GOD or *the* SON *of* GOD? You have already heard his reply to these questions, nor is the substance of that reply in any respect at variance with what the apostle has advanced in the course

of his gospel. He has recorded no fact; he has preserved no discourse; he has permitted no observation to escape him, from which it can be inferred, by the rules of sound interpretation, that the nature of Jesus was superior to that of man. On the other hand, he has not been backward to declare that God gave him the spirit without measure; called him his best beloved and only begotten son; made him the chosen revealer of his will to mankind; and constituted him his sole representative and vicegerent upon earth. These, indeed, are important offices, and worthy of the exalted personage invested with them. But had Jesus been what he is represented by orthodox writers, you would have met with something to remind you of it in every page, not of this gospel only, but of every book of Scripture. It would have been enforced in terms too obvious and unequivocal to admit of doubt. You would have found it in all the gospels. Paul would have taught it: Peter would have taught it: James would have taught it: John would have taught it. But what is the fact? They have all observed a profound silence respecting it; and uniformly spoken of Jesus as a subordinate and dependent creature. Be it our object, then, to study, with care and impartiality, what they have written; employing the reason

which God has given us, and rejecting the glosses and interpretations of fallible men. Revelation will then cease to be a mystery; and the sacred oracles will no longer be to us "a fountain shut up" or "a book sealed."

Scriptural Proof that the Holy Spirit is not an Intelligent Being distinct from God the Father.

The terms *Holy Spirit* and *Spirit of God* are admitted to be synonymous both by the Trinitarian and the Unitarian. It is not till they begin to define the meaning of these terms that any difference of opinion arises between them; and the difference is then abundantly apparent. The separate personal existence of the Holy Spirit is a doctrine essential to the creed of the Trinitarian. The formulary erroneously ascribed to Athanasius, and adopted by the Church of England, maintains that "there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost;" and yet that "the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one;—the glory equal, the majesty coeter-

nal." The Unitarian cannot conscientiously subscribe to this doctrine, because he is unable to discover any foundation for it in the language of Scripture. He is aware, however, that, on the ground of this rejection, his adversary, if he have not recourse to harsher terms, will, in all probability, charge him with obstinate prejudice and invincible ignorance. Whether it is that his mental vision is obscured; or whether he wilfully shuts his eyes against the light of truth; or whether his adversary is mistaken in his opinion, and advances a groundless charge against him; the following observations may perhaps assist us in some measure to determine.

It is common for the sacred writers to employ *the spirit of a person* to denote *a person himself.* Thus it is said, in reference to Moses, that the Israelites "provoked *his spirit*, so that he spake unadvisedly with his lips;" Ps. cvi. 33.—and this language is explained in the forty third verse, where it is said "they provoked *him* with their counsel." The common valedictory wish of the apostle Paul at the conclusion of his epistles is "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with *you.*"—See Rom. xvi. 20, 24. 1 Cor. xvi. 23. Phil. iv. 23. 1 Thes. v. 28. 2 Thes. iii. 18. But in some instances he has adopted the above

periphrasis of the Psalmist:—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with *your spirit*." Gal. vi. 18. Philem. 25. See also 2 Tim. iv. 22:—and in the following passage he has not only identified the *spirit of man* with *man himself*, but has thence argued in favour of a similar identity in the Divine Nature. "What man knoweth *the things of a man*, save *the spirit of man* which is in him? Even so, *the things of* GOD knoweth none but *the Spirit of* GOD." 1 Cor. ii. 11. From the above premises I deduce these plain and obvious inferences. *The Spirit of God* or *Holy Spirit* is a phrase used by the sacred writers to denote the *Divine Mind*, in precisely the same sense that *the spirit of man* denotes the *human mind;* and as *man* and *his spirit* are one and the same person, *God* and *the Spirit of God* are likewise one and the same person.

But on these points we need not rest satisfied with the mere deductions of reason: for they are set forth in numerous and express declarations of Scripture. The Evangelist Matthew thus records an observation made by Jesus to the Pharisees: "If I cast out dæmons by *the Spirit of God*, then the kingdom of God is come unto you:" Mat. xii. 28. and that *the Spirit of God* here signifies the *power of God*, or *God himself*, is clearly

manifest from the parallel place in Luke's Gospel. "If I with the *finger of God* cast out dæmons, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." Luke xi 20. The Psalmist, imploring assistance from above, says, "Cast me not away from *thy presence*, and take not *thy Holy Spirit* from me:" Ps. li. 11. and again, in allusion to the divine omnipresence, he exclaims, "Whither shall I go from *thy Spirit*, or whither shall I flee from *thy presence?*" Ps. cxxxix. 7. evidently meaning by the pronoun THY, in both instances, GOD HIMSELF; and by *Spirit* and *Holy Spirit* the *presence and energy of* GOD. In the Acts of the Apostles Peter is represented as thus addressing Ananias. "Why hath Satan filled thine heart *to lie to* THE HOLY GHOST, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast *not lied unto men, but unto* GOD." Acts v. 3, 4. Now that the Holy Ghost or God against whom Ananias had lied was the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, I am authorised to infer from the combined testimony of three Evangelists. Let the Trinitarian compare the following parallel passages; and let him reconcile, if he can, to the satisfaction of his

own mind, the difficulty which, according to his system, arises from the comparison.

It is not ye that speak, but *the Holy Ghost.* Mark xiii. 11. See also Luke xii. 12.	It is not ye that speak, but *the Spirit of your Father* which speaketh in you. Mat. x. 20.

If the substantial meaning of our Lord's expression is conveyed by all three Evangelists; (and, though they cannot all have reported his exact words, God forbid that we should charge any of them with misrepresentation or error!) then the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit is a doctrine of mere human invention, baseless and visionary as the dream of the enthusiast.

But the term *Holy Spirit* is frequently employed by the sacred writers to denote *the effect* as well as *the efficient cause;* the *manifestation of divine power* as well as *divine power itself.* Thus, it is said to be *given,* and to *fall* or *come upon* persons inspired. "When Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost *was given,* he offered them money." Acts viii. 18.—"The Holy Ghost *fell on* all them which heard the word." x. 44.—"And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost *came on* them." xix. 6. Men are likewise

said to *receive* it, and to *be filled with* it. "*Receive* ye the Holy Ghost." John xx. 22.—"And they *were* all *filled with* the Holy Ghost." Acts ii. 4.—"Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, *full of* the Holy Ghost and wisdom." vi. 3. It is also represented as *dwelling in* holy men, and *influencing* their conduct and actions in various ways. "That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which *dwelleth in* us." 2 Tim. i. 14. —"And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost—*was led* by the Spirit into the wilderness." Luke iv. 1.—"They *were forbidden* of the Holy Ghost." Acts xvi. 6.—"The Spirit *suffered them not*."* vs. 7. The Holy Ghost, then, or Holy Spirit, as

---

* In the above passages the common rendering has been studiously retained; but there can be no doubt that they would have expressed the sense of the original more exactly, if the article had been, in some instances, rejected. Thus, we should have read "And they were all filled with *holy spirit*. Look ye out among you seven men full of *holy spirit* and wisdom. &c." It is likewise evident that the phrase *Holy Spirit* might, in various passages of the New Testament, have been rendered, conformably to the idiom of our own language, and without the slightest violence to the original, *holiness of spirit* or *spirit of holiness*. Both these phrases are found in the apostolical writings. Thus, Peter addresses his epistle "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia; elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through *holiness of spirit*:" 1 Pet. i. 1, 2. and Paul, speaking of the exaltation of Jesus, says that he was "declared to be the son of God with power, according to the *spirit of holiness*, by the resurrection from the dead." Rom. i. 4. Compare with this latter passage i. Pet. iii. 18. and see Schleusner under the word ΠΝΕΥΜΑ. §. 10.

shed upon our Lord and his apostles, denotes a supernatural impulse, or communication of spiritual gifts and powers from on high: the Being from whom it proceeds is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose presence pervades all space, and whose influence extends to the remotest bounds of creation.

It only remains to be observed on this head that there are a few passages of Scripture in which the Holy Spirit is personified, or spoken of as a person or intelligent being: those, for instance, in the Gospel of John, which relate to the promise of the Holy Spirit under the name of *a Comforter*, and which occur in the affectionate address of Jesus to his apostles a short time before his crucifixion. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you *another Comforter*, that he may abide with you for ever." John xiv. 16.—See also vs. 26. xv. 26, 27. xvi. 7,—14. The *Comforter* promised in the above cited passage is styled *another* Comforter, probably in allusion to Jesus, who had been their Comforter during his abode among them, and whose absence it was now necessary to supply. Nor is it improbable that the apostles, from this highly figurative language, were led to expect that this Comforter would be a real person like Jesus,

though they could have had no distinct idea of the circumstances and time of his appearance. But it was not long before they were instructed in both these particulars: for Jesus, immediately after his resurrection, reminded them of the promise which he had made; and prepared them for its fulfilment in the following remarkable words. "Behold I send *the promise of my Father* upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be *endued with power* from on high." Luke xxiv. 49. And again, "Wait for *the promise of the Father*, which ye have heard of me: for John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with *the Holy Ghost* not many days hence." Acts i. 4, 5. It appears, therefore, that *the promise of the Father* was the communication of *power from on high*, or *baptism with the Holy Spirit;* and that, in a few days, this promise was to receive its accomplishment. Cast your eye, then, upon the chapter immediately following that which has just been quoted, and the whole subject will be made clear. "When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place: and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of *a rushing mighty wind;* and it *filled all the house* where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon

each of them. And they were all *filled with the Holy Ghost*, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts ii. 1,—4. The term *Comforter* was liable to misconstruction; but its meaning ceases now to be ambiguous, and all doubts are resolved. The promise of Jesus receives its accomplishment; his apostles are literally *baptized with the Holy Spirit;* and, under the powerful influence of God exerted upon their minds, they go forth into the world conquering and to conquer.

On the whole, then, it appears, that the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit is a doctrine altogether unauthorized by Scripture. Personification, it is well known to all who are conversant in the language of the New Testament, is a common figure among the sacred writers. Thus, *Death* and *Sin* are frequently personified by the apostle Paul; and *Charity* is spoken of, in the most animated and glowing language, by the same writer, as meek, patient and forgiving; bearing all things, believing all things, and hoping all things. 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 7. But these are clearly figurative expressions; and ought not, therefore, to be literally understood. Apply, then, the same principle of interpretation to those passages in which the Holy Spirit is personified

by Jesus, and his language will appear, not only consistent with the usual idiom of the New Testament, but admirably descriptive of those miraculous gifts which were diffused among the apostles after his ascension into heaven, and which tended to preserve in them an habitual consciousness of the divine presence and blessing.

I proceed now, however, to the third and last subject on which I proposed to treat; and although what I shall advance on this head may possess but slight claims to the character of originality, it will be found, I hope, at least, to give a clear and impartial view of many things which are little known to the majority of Christians, but which derive great importance from their connection with the study of sacred and revealed truth.

GROUNDS OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CANON AND TEXT ADOPTED BY THE EDITORS OF THE IMPROVED VERSION AND THOSE OF THE AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION.

Canon of the New Testament.

It is commonly urged against Unitarians that they have not the same reverence for the Bible which is found among other denominations of

Christians; and that they alter passages which do not accord with their own views, so as to make them convey a sense entirely foreign from that of the original authors. But no denomination of Christians, I will venture to affirm, has done more, in proportion to its numbers, to establish the genuineness of the books of Scripture, and shield them from the attacks of infidels, than Unitarians. Let the appeal be made to facts, and where will you find a person, among the ranks of orthodoxy, who has laboured to confirm the truth of the Christian Religion, with as much assiduity and success as Lardner? His Credibility of the Gospel History, and Collection of Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, constitute by far the ablest defence of Christianity which the world has ever seen; and yet he is classed by many among the revilers of Jesus, and the enemies of his Gospel!! The truth indeed is that Unitarians have wished to see the evidence in favour of Christianity placed upon rational and satisfactory grounds; and, with this view, have paid particular attention to the arguments which prove it to be a Divine Revelation. "Our assent," say they, "is required to certain statements and propositions claiming to be of heavenly origin. Let us satisfy ourselves that the claim is well founded, and we

will yield to every gospel precept a free and unhesitating obedience; we will embrace every gospel doctrine with joy and gladness; we will follow our divine instructer through evil report and through good report, and count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord." Phil. iii. 8. Such is the principle adopted by Unitarians; and, in conformity with this principle, they study the evidences of Revelation, and make themselves acquainted with the proper sources and legitimate objects of Biblical Criticism, before they attempt to understand or explain the doctrines of Christianity.

But here a question occurs which it is of some importance to notice; and I introduce it in this place because I consider it to have been one fruitful source of the errors which have prevailed respecting Unitarianism. It relates to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, and has been more or less discussed by almost every denomination of Christians. In calling your attention to it, therefore, I do that to which I am invited by the example of the candid and liberal among all parties: I tread in the footsteps of those who have been long and deservedly regarded as the ornament and glory of Christianity: I appeal to well known historical facts,

which it would be presumption and folly to deny. On these grounds, then, I assert with confidence, that the genuineness of every book of the New Testament demands a separate investigation. I maintain that the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are as distinct from each other as the histories of Hume, Rapin, Oldmixon and Geoffry of Monmouth. Nor has any individual, or assemblage of men a right to determine whether I shall receive them or not as the genuine productions of the persons whose names they bear. I believe, indeed, that all the historical books of the New Testament are properly assigned to their respective authors, and am willing to receive them as containing authentic narratives of the life and ministry of Jesus and his apostles: but I believe these things, not because others have believed them before me, but because I have been at the pains of examining the subject for myself. I believe too that the epistles inscribed to the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians and the Thessalonians; as well as those addressed to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, are the genuine productions of the apostle Paul; because I am well satisfied, from the evidence adduced, that they could have been written by no

one else. But, for various and weighty reasons, I cannot, with the same confidence, affirm that Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, although it is assigned to him in the title which the editors of the Received Version have prefixed to it in their translation. I think it highly probable that the epistle commonly ascribed to James is genuine, because it appears to have been known to Clemens Romanus and Hermas, two of the earliest Apostolical Fathers; and because it is found in the Canon of the first Syriac New Testament, which is decidedly the most ancient version of the Christian Scriptures. I believe that, of the epistles ascribed to John and Peter, the first of each is genuine; but am compelled to state respecting the others, (viz. the second of Peter, and the second and third of John,) that there is no evidence to establish the fact of their general reception in the early ages of the Christian Church. And for similar reasons, I think, with Lardner and many others, that the epistle of Jude and the Apocalypse ought not to be regarded as of sufficient authority to establish by themselves any point of doctrine.—The testimony on which these opinions are founded it shall now be my object to state, under the four following divisions. *First*, the evidence of

the Apostolical Fathers; *secondly*, that of the early Syrian Christians; *thirdly*, that of Origen; and *fourthly*, that of Eusebius Pamphilus.

I.

(1.) Express allusions to particular books of the N. T. by

Clemens Rom. A. D. 96.	*Ignatius.* A. D. 107.	*Polycarp.* A. D. 108.
1 Corinthians.*	———	1 Corinthians.†
———	Ephesians.‡	Ephesians.§
———	———	Philippians.‖

* "Take into your hands the epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What did he at the first write to you in the beginning of the Gospel? Verily he did by the Spirit admonish you concerning himself, and *Cephas*, and *Apollos*, because that even then you did form parties." Clem. Ep. 1. Cap. xlvii. This is evidently an allusion to 1 Cor. i. 12.

† "*Do we not know, that the saints shall judge the world?* as Paul teaches." This passage is found in Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, Cap. xi. and contains a direct allusion to 1 Cor. vi. 2.

‡ Ignatius, writing to the *Ephesians*, says, (Sect. 12.) "Ye are the companions of Paul the sanctified, the martyr, deservedly most happy, who, throughout all his epistle, makes mention of you in Christ Jesus."

§ "I trust that ye are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures, As in these Scriptures it is said *Be ye angry, and sin not*, and *let not the sun go down upon your wrath.*" From this passage, which occurs in Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, (Cap. xii.) it appears that the writings of the New Testament had in his time acquired the name of Sacred Writings, or Holy Scriptures; and that the epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, which is here quoted, (iv. 26.) formed part of the collection.

‖ "For neither I, nor any one like me can come up to the wisdom of

(2.) Highly probable allusions to particular books of the N. T. by

Barnabas. A. D. 71.	*Clem. Rom.* A. D. 96.	*Hermas.* A. D. 100.	*Ignatius.* A. D. 107.	*Polycarp.** A. D. 108.
Matthew.	———	Matthew.	Matthew.	Matthew.
———	———	Luke.	———	Luke.
———	———	———	John.	———
———	———	———	———	Acts.
———	Romans.	———	———	Romans.
———	———	———	———	2 Corinthians.
———	———	———	———	Galatians.
———	———	———	———	1 Thessalonians.
———	———	———	———	2 Thessalonians.
———	———	———	———	1 Timothy.
———	———	———	———	2 Timothy.
———	———	———	———	1 Peter.
———	———	———	———	1 John.

(3.) Probable and supposed allusions to particular books of the N. T. by

Clem. Rom. A. D. 96.	*Hermas.* A. D. 100.	*Ignatius.* A. D. 107.
Matthew.	———	———
Mark.	———	———

---

the blessed and renowned Paul, who, when absent, wrote you an epistle; into which if ye look, ye will be able to edify yourselves in the faith which has been delivered to you." Polyc. Ep. Phil. Cap. iii.

* The above testimony of Polycarp is highly important; and it is reasonable to suppose, that all the books alluded to by him were received as genuine by the Church at Smyrna in his time. But, as his references were only occasional, and many of his epistles are lost, we are not justified in concluding, from his silence respecting the other books in our Canon, that he certainly rejected them. The testimony of Clement is also valuable; and may be considered as that of the Church of Rome at the time when he lived.

Luke.	———	———
———	John.	———
Acts.	Acts.	Acts.
———	Romans.	Romans.
———	1 Corinthians.	1 Corinthians.
2 Corinthians.	———	2 Corinthians.
Galatians.	———	Galatians.
Ephesians.	Ephesians.	———
Philippians.	———	Philippians.
Colossians.	———	———
1 Thessalonians.	———	1 Thessalonians.
1 Timothy.	———	———
2 Timothy.	———	2 Timothy.
Titus.	———	———
———	———	Philemon.
Hebrews.*	———	———

* Eusebius and Jerome inform us that the Church of Rome did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews at the period when they wrote; and the probability is that it was not received at the time of Clement; because it seems unlikely that any Church should reject a book after having once received it as the genuine production of an apostle. For this reason the epistle to the Hebrews is not inserted in the above collection of testimonies, although there are many passages in which that and the epistle of Clement bear a striking resemblance to each other. But there are additional reasons for doubting the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews. Caius, who is supposed to have been a Presbyter of Rome, and who flourished about the year 200, enumerates only thirteen epistles of Paul, and says that the one inscribed to the Hebrews is not his. Origen, a Presbyter of Alexandria, about twenty years after Caius, speaks of the doubts which prevailed in his time respecting the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews. It deserves likewise to be noticed that the position of this epistle in the N. T. implies a doubt as to its genuineness on the part of those who made the present arrangement; for every Christian knows, or ought to be informed, that Paul's epistles are arranged, not according to the time when they were written, but according to the supposed rank and importance of those to whom they are addressed. Thus, the epistles incribed to whole communities are placed first, and those intended for the use of individuals come second in order; whereas, the common position of the epistle to the Hebrews,

James.	James.*	———
1 Peter.	———	1 Peter.
2 Peter.	———	———
———	———	1 John.
———	———	3 John.

II.

If now we have recourse to the testimony of the Syriac Version we shall find a Canon corresponding very nearly with the one which may be deduced from the foregoing tables:—viz. the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen epistles of Paul, the epistle of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John. To this has been added, by some, the epistle to the Hebrews, but without sufficient reason; Michaëlis having proved, from internal evidence, that it was not translated by the same person to whom we are indebted for a translation of the other books.†

---

contrary to the principle of arrangement adopted by those who formed the Received Canon, is after that addressed to Philemon. "It is only found at the end of those books," says Father Simon, "as foreign to the work, and as a piece that does not carry the same authority with the others."

* Lardner produces no less than seven passages in which Hermas appears to have had an eye to this epistle; and concludes his quotations by saying "I suppose all these passages are sufficient to prove the antiquity of the epistle of St. *James*, and that *Hermas* alluded to it, and had a high respect for it."—Credib. Pt. ii. Vol. i. Bk. i. Ch. iv. p. 134.

† Michaëlis's Introd. by Marsh, Vol. ii. Ch. vii. §. ii. p. 5—8.

Now the learned Jeremiah Jones, in his "*New and Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*,"* earnestly contends for the antiquity of the Syriac Version, and has produced many arguments to shew that it was made in or near the times of the Apostles. Michaëlis entertains exactly the same view of the question,† and has shewn that it is quoted by Ephrem the Syrian, who lived about the year of Christ 370. He has also alleged, in favour of the antiquity of this version, "its general reception among all the sects of the Syrian Christians, a circumstance which evidently proves it to have been in general use before the Syrian Church was divided into parties;" that is, about the end of the third century.‡ For a more ancient date than this we have no positive evidence, though many facts concur to render it probable that it existed a century or two earlier. "It certainly was made before the fourth," says Butler,§ "and there are arguments to shew it was made at the end of the first, or the beginning of the second century." This version, then, affords positive

---

* Vol. i. Pt. i. Ch. xiv.—xix. † Introd. Vol. ii. Ch. vii. §. vi. vii.

‡ Ernesti, speaking of this version, says, "jam ante schisma Eutychianum et Nestorianum, forte Sec. ii. facta est." Inst. Interp. N. T. Pars iii. Cap. iv. §. 3. § Horæ Biblicæ, Vol. i. p. 183.

testimony that the Syrian Christians, at a very early period, received twenty-one and omitted six of the books which compose our present canon of the N. T. The books which they received have been already enumerated: those which they appear to have rejected are, the epistle to the Hebrews, the second epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, the epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse.

III.

Nearly similar appears to have been the Canon of the Church of Alexandria at the beginning of the third century. The earliest catalogue of Canonical Books which is now extant was drawn up by Origen, a Presbyter of this Church, whom Lardner places in the year 230. This catalogue contains the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Paul, the first epistle of Peter, the first epistle of John, and the Apocalypse.*

* The Apocalypse is frequently mentioned both by Origen and Cyprian as the production of the apostle John, and appears to have been generally received as such in their time by the different African Churches both Greek and Latin. But we have seen nothing in the preceding testimonies to warrant its insertion in the Canon of the New Testament. It forms no part of the old Syriac Version, and there is not the most distant allusion to it in the writings of Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, or Polycarp. Hermas, indeed, makes use of expressions which greatly resemble the style of many passages in this book; but the similarity is

The epistle to the Hebrews is likewise included in it,* as having been dictated by Paul, or written by some one who was intimately conversant with his style and manner of writing. But in this

---

not such as to warrant the conclusion that he has borrowed from it in any instance. It may, however, have existed, and probably did exist, in the time of Hermas, and still may not have been the genuine production of the apostle John; although it is ascribed to him by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian, all of whom were eminent Christian Fathers of the second century. These testimonies to its genuineness, it must be confessed, are highly important; and yet, in the estimation of many celebrated Christian writers, they are not sufficient to justify its insertion among the canonical books of the New Testament. "I put it," says Luther, (Preface to his German Translation. Ed. 1522.) "almost in the same rank with the fourth book of Esdras, and cannot any way find that it was dictated by the Holy Ghost."—"I candidly confess." says Michaëlis, (Introd. Vol. iv. c. 33. Sect. i.) "that on the main question, whether it is a genuine work of St. John the Evangelist, I have not been able to obtain that certainty, which I have obtained in respect to other books of the New Testament."—"Among the spurious books," said Eusebius fifteen hundred years ago, (Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 25.) "let the Revelation of John be ranked, (if you think good,) which, as I have said, some reject, but others allow of and admit among those books that are received as unquestionable and undoubted." Amidst this contrariety of opinions it is now impossible to ascertain the truth. Many circumstances, however, appear to authorize the rejection of it from the true Canon of Scripture. Caius, who has been already mentioned, (p. 47.) ascribes to Cerinthus a book of Revelations, which could have been no other than that usually supposed to have been written by John, and which he pronounces a forgery. (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 28.) Dionysius, a pupil of Origen, and Bishop of Alexandria, says, (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. vii. c. 25.) "Some who were before us have utterly rejected and confuted this book, criticising every paragraph; adding, moreover, that the inscription is false, forasmuch as it is not John's; and that not only no Apostle, but not so much as any holy or ecclesiastical man was the author of this writing; but that Cerinthus, founder of the heresy called after

---

* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 25.

opinion Origen and his followers appear to have been singular.* The works of Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage, and Primate of all Africa, A. D. 250. abound in quotations from Scripture, and yet they contain not a single allusion to this epistle. "We know very well," says Lardner, "that there were Christians before Origen, as well as others about his time, who did not consider this as one of Paul's epistles:" to which he adds, "It is not easy to prove, that any Christians of the first two centuries, or some-

---

him Cerinthian, the better to recommend his own forgery, prefixed to it an honourable name." Now I assert not, on these grounds, that Cerinthus was the undisputed author of the book of Revelation; but this I affirm and maintain,—that Dionysius, whose testimony is equal to that of the most unexceptionable among the ancient fathers, has put it beyond dispute that the genuineness of this book was not established in the second century. And this testimony, I may be permitted to add, is greatly strengthened by that of subsequent writers: for, between the time of Dionysius and that of Jerome, including a space of about 120 years, we have eight catalogues of the books of the New Testament, and only three of these contain the Apocalypse. (See Jones on the Canon. Vol. i. Pt. i. Ch. viii.) Those which have it not are the lists of Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A. D. 340; of the Bishops assembled at the Council of Laodicea, (according to Jones,) A. D. 364; of Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 375; and of Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, in Venice, A. D. 380. Eusebius, likewise, appears to have been convinced that it was spurious, though he does not absolutely declare it so; probably out of respect to the judgment of his master Origen, who, notwithstanding his superiority as a Biblical scholar, was too fond of allegory and allegorical interpretations.

* "Origenis sententia hac in re peculiaris fuisse videtur." Millii Proleg. n. 217.

what lower, who lived in that part of the Roman Empire, where the Latin tongue was chiefly used, received this as an epistle of Paul."*—The books mentioned by Origen as well known in his time, though controverted by some, are the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the epistle of Jude.

IV.

But it is now time that we should examine the Catalogue of Eusebius, to whom we are indebted for a valuable Ecclesiastical History of the first three centuries after Christ, and who has collected within a small compass almost every thing which can be said upon the subject of the Canon. The testimony of this eminent Father to the genuineness of the books of the N. T. is appealed to by all parties as the most important which history can now furnish; and, indeed, had it not been for the materials with which his industry has supplied us, it must be confessed that our information would have been much less copious and satisfactory than it is. But whether it is owing to the corruptions which his writings have undergone, the peculiar difficulty of the subject, or the caution which he found it necessary to

* Credib. Pt. ii. Vol. iii. p. 255.

exercise in the course of his remarks, one thing is certain;—that much of what he has said is involved in deep and almost impenetrable obscurity. I shall, however, transcribe from Lardner greater part of that passage in his Ecclesiastical History* which treats "*of the Scriptures universally acknowledged, and those that are not such;*" and shall then endeavour, by a comparison with other passages in the same work, to illustrate and explain his meaning.

"It will be proper," says Eusebius, "to enumerate here in a summarie way, the books of the New Testament, which have been already mentioned. And in the first place are to be ranked the sacred four Gospels. Then the book of the Acts of the Apostles. After that are to be reckoned the Epistles of *Paul*. In the next place, that called the first Epistle of *John*, and the [first] Epistle of *Peter* are to be esteemed authentic. After these, is to be placed, if it be thought fit, the revelation of *John*, about which we shall observe the different opinions at a proper season. Of the controverted, but yet well known or approved by the most, [or many] are that called the Epistle of *James*, and that of

---

* Lib. iii. Cap. 25.

Jude, and the second of *Peter*, and the second and third of *John:* whether they are written by the Evangelist, or another of the same name. Among the spurious are to be placed the Acts of *Paul*, and the book entitled the Shepherd, and the Revelation of *Peter:* and beside these, that called the Epistle of *Barnabas*, and the book named the Doctrines of the Apostles. And moreover, as I said, the Revelation of *John*, if it seem meet: which some, as I have said, reject, others reckon among the books universally received. Among these also some have reckoned the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which the Hebrews who have embraced Christ make use of. All these may be reckoned controverted."

In the preceding quotation, which certainly is not remarkable for distinctness and perspicuity, several writings are enumerated among the *spurious* and *controverted* books, which Origen has quoted with evident marks of approbation. Among these may be particularized the Acts of *Paul*, the Epistle of *Barnabas*, and the Shepherd of *Hermas;* the last of which he considers as a "divinely inspired" book. In the *spurious* class Eusebius likewise appears inclined to rank

the Apocalypse:* and if, with respect to this book, the testimony of Origen is to be preferred, it may fairly admit of a question whether the other three, and particularly the Shepherd of *Hermas*, are not, on the same ground, entitled to a place among the Canonical books of the New Testament.

In the above extract you will likewise observe that the authenticity of Paul's Epistles is acknowledged in general terms, and no exception made with regard to the epistle to the Hebrews; from

---

* "As for *Eusebe's* own opinion," says Lardner, (Credib. Pt. ii. Bk. i. Ch. lxxii. Sect. ix. par. 31—33.) "it does not appear, that he received it, as a book of the New Testament.—That he was not positive of its being writ by *John* the Apostle and Evangelist is apparent from a passage, where he says, 'It is likely, that the Revelation, which goes under the name of *John*, was seen by the second, if not by the first:' that is, by *John* the Elder, if not by *John* the Apostle.—Nor can I say, that *Eusebe* has in any of his works quoted the Revelation in the way of proof of any doctrine. He does indeed refer to it sometimes. And he quotes it in his Demonstration. But it appears to me very remarkable, that in the long Commentarie upon the Psalms, and in the Commentarie upon *Isaias*, there is not one quotation of this book, nor, I think, any notice taken of it. In the Commentarie upon the Psalms there are numerous quotations out of the Gospels and Acts. All *Paul's* Epistles are quoted, except the Epistle to *Titus*, and most of them often. The Epistle of *James*, the first of *Peter*, and the first of *John*, are also quoted there. But not one word from the book of the Revelation. It is farther to be observed, that in the Commentaries upon the Psalms and *Isaias* he had many fair occasions for quoting this book. His argument often led him to do so, and he could not but think of it. Nevertheless, not one word about it, that I remember. He seems to me therefore studiously to have avoided all notice of the Revelation."

which it has been inferred by some that Eusebius meant to include this epistle among the *undisputed* writings of Paul. But this assumption is directly at variance with another passage, where he informs us that "some reject it, urging for their opinion, that it is contradicted by the Church of the Romans, as not being *Paul's*."* This, with other passages which might have been enumerated,† certainly proves that Eusebius never intended to class the epistle to the Hebrews among the *genuine* writings of Paul. Of its claim to be inserted among the books of the New Testament, he might be disposed to think more favourably than some of his predecessors; but he could not, under the circumstances above mentioned, have regarded it as the *undisputed* production of the apostle.

Of the seven epistles usually styled Catholic, Eusebius informs us, in the above cited passage,

---

* Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 3.

† "As the evidence of this Epistle being *Paul's* did not appear equally clear with that for his other Epistles; the persuasion," says Lardner, "was not equally certain, and doubts, as it seems, were sometimes apt to arise in his mind about it.—It is generally supposed, that he received it as one of *Paul's* Epistles. I think likewise, that he was well disposed to that sentiment. Nevertheless I suspect, that he had doubts, and was not clear and positive on that side the question." Credib. Pt. ii. Bk. i. Ch. lxxii. Sect. ix. par. 16, 39.

that two only are to be received as *undoubtedly genuine;* namely, the first of John, and the first of Peter. Of the five disputed ones he seems inclined to pay most deference to that of James. Of the second of Peter he says, "We are informed by the tradition of the ancients that it is not a part of the New Testament: to which he adds, "I know of but one epistle only that is genuine, and acknowledged by the Presbyters of former times."* The second and third epistles of John are never quoted by him; nor is there any reference to that of Jude in the whole of his voluminous works.

Such, then, is a brief abstract of the testimony for and against the Received Canon of the New Testament; on the strength of which the Editors of the "IMPROVED VERSION"† have printed the

---

* Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 3.

† The following is the title of this excellent work, of which, besides the small pocket Edition without notes, four large impressions have been already published in royal 8vo. and royal 12mo.: "*The New Testament, in an Improved Version, upon the Basis of Archbishop Newcome's New Translation: with a Corrected Text, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. Published by the Unitarian Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue, by the distribution of books.*" The fourth is the Edition referred to by the writer of this letter, as containing, among many valuable improvements upon the former Editions, the last revisal which the work has undergone.

following list of *Disputed Books* at the foot of their Table of Contents.

Hebrews,	2 and 3 John,
James,	Jude,
2 Peter.	Revelation.

My own opinion as to the genuineness of these books has been already stated explicitly and without reserve; (p. 44.) and I take this opportunity of disclaiming any intention to involve the Editors of the "Improved Version" in the consequences which may result from that statement. My sole object has been to establish the validity of a principle which we acknowledge in common, and for the consistent avowal of which we are alike exposed to the calumnies and misrepresentations of our adversaries. In the application of that principle the Editors in question have been led to the following results, which, I cannot help saying, do great credit to their candour and moderation.—They suppose that the epistle to the Hebrews "was written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, because it contains no allusion to those calamitous events;"* but profess, with Origen, to be totally in the dark respecting its author. With regard to the epistle commonly ascribed to James they remark,

* p. 544.

"This excellent epistle is one of those the genuineness of which was disputed in the primitive church. But it is not unworthy of the apostle to whom it is generally ascribed."* In allusion to the genuineness of what is usually styled the second epistle of Peter, they quote the decisions of Eusebius and Lardner, and add, "Some have thought the first and third chapters genuine, but from the difference of style have doubted of the second;"† and, accordingly, print this chapter in a character different from the rest of the epistle. They appear to regard the second and third of the epistles ascribed to John as genuine;‡ and attribute the circumstance of their having been disputed in and before the time of Eusebius "to their brevity, and to their being addressed to particular persons;" adding, with Dr. Priestley, that "both the subjects and the language are so much the same with those of the former epistle, that there cannot be a doubt of their having the same author."‖ The epistle to which the name

---

* p. 552. † p. 562. ‡ p. 579.

‖ These conjectures are, in all probability, well founded; and may, perhaps, be allowed to have some weight in determining our opinion respecting the degree of credit due to the other *Disputed Books* of the N. T. But it should be recollected that, however favourably we may be inclined to think of any writings in the Received Canon, on the ground of internal or circumstantial evidence alone, none ought to be regarded as genuine parts of Scripture, but upon the positive and

of Jude is prefixed they seem less inclined to retain as a genuine part of Scripture than any any book of the New Testament:* but the Apocalypse or book of Revelation they regard as by no means deficient in external evidence, although disposed to rest the proof of its divine authority, "as a book of prophecy, chiefly upon the perceived accomplishment of the predictions which it contains."†

So far, then, we have discovered no just cause of complaint against the Editors of the "Improved Version." They have broached no new opinions on the subject of the Canon: they have stood forward as the advocates of no peculiar system: their references are all clear and satisfactory, and their authorities of the most respectable kind: their conclusions are neither hasty nor unfounded; and, though they have ventured to express doubts on some particular points, they have not removed a single book from the New Testament, or stated a single fact which is not confirmed by

---

express testimony of approved witnesses. Such books may indeed be "publicly read in Christian Assemblies, for the Edification of the people," or quoted in conjunction with other *well authenticated Books*; but certainly ought not to "be alleged as affording alone sufficient proof of any doctrine."

* p. 583. † p. 587.

the most ample and unexceptionable testimony. But other objections, dictated, I fear, in too many instances, by an unchristian spirit of opposition rather than a conscientious regard to truth, are advanced against the principles adopted by the Editors of the "Improved Version" in the formation of their *Text*. A brief examination of these objections will form no unsuitable conclusion to the foregoing remarks; and nothing will then be wanting to fill up the outline of our present inquiry.

Text of the New Testament.

THE doctrines of Unitarianism are few and simple; nor, we may be bold to say, are they so far deficient in Scriptural authority as to require any additional aid from interpolations. That "there is *one* GOD and *one Mediator* between God and men, *the* MAN *Christ Jesus*," (1 Tim. ii. 5.) are plain and obvious declarations of the New Testament; and these declarations, as you have already seen, constitute the fundamental articles of the Unitarian's Creed. From various causes, however, the Common Version of the New Testament is clogged with many additions, which it is the object of

the Unitarian to remove; and it is in the accomplishment of this object that he incurs the charge of mutilating and defacing the *Inspired Word of God.* But let us be cautious, my dear Friend, in the use of terms to which we affix no definite meaning. What is implied in the phrase *Inspired Word of God?*—Has that *Word,* (free, I am prepared to grant, on its first publication, from any admixture of error, though transmitted to us upon frail and perishable materials, and copied in innumerable different shapes by ignorant and fallible men,) experienced no change in the lapse of nearly two thousand years? Has its integrity, think you, been affected in no degree by the negligence or wilful corruptions of transcribers? And do we now possess it as pure and unadulterated as it was found in the autographs of the sacred writers themselves? If so, the discussion is at an end, and Unitarians justly merit the reproaches which have been heaped upon them by their opponents. But before this point is conceded it will be necessary to make a few observations.

The New Testament, as you doubtless know, was originally written in Greek. This was the language generally adopted in the early ages of Christianity as the medium of intercourse between

different nations; and was, therefore, better calculated than any other to give an extensive diffusion to the genuine records of the Christian Faith. But when that Faith began to extend itself into the nations of the West, Latin Versions were multiplied to an almost incredible extent. Augustine, in his treatise "*de Doctrina Christiana*," Lib. ii. Cap. xi. says, "that the number of those who had translated the Scriptures from the Hebrew into the Greek, might be computed; but that the number of those who had translated the Greek into the Latin could not. For immediately upon the first introduction of Christianity, if a person got possession of a Greek manuscript, and thought he had any knowledge of the two languages, he set about translating the Scriptures." The multiplicity of versions occasioned by this rage for translating was a source of great confusion, and appears to have been one of the leading motives with Jerome for undertaking his Latin version at the close of the fourth century. This version had many decided enemies on its first appearance; though it soon grew into favour, and, in time, almost superseded the original itself, which might as well have perished, amidst other ancient and valuable records, for any real benefit of which it was to the generality of Christian professors during the dark ages.

The first printed Edition of the Greek New Testament was prepared for publication by Erasmus at the beginning of the sixteenth century from eight manuscripts of comparatively little value.* Five editions of this were published in the years 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527 and 1535. In 1517 the Complutensian Edition made its appearance under the patronage of Cardinal Ximenes. Shortly afterwards other Editions were published by Robert Stephens, Beza and the Elzevirs, differing very little from those of Erasmus and the Complutensian, or from each other. The editions of Robert Stephens are five in number, of which four were published by himself in the years 1546, 1549, 1550 and 1551; and one by his son Henry in 1569. Beza principally follows the third edition of Robert Stephens; and his editions, which are also five in number, were published in the years 1565, 1576, 1582, 1589 and 1598. In 1624 the celebrated Edition of the Elzevirs appeared. This was likewise printed from the third edition of Robert Stephens;† and, where it varies from that edition,

* Marsh's Mich. Vol. ii. Pt. ii. p. 846. note 28.

† In this edition only fifteen manuscripts were employed. These were not collated by Robert Stephens himself, but by his son Henry, "who was at that time too young, too impatient, and too little experienced in criticism, for an undertaking of that nature." Marsh's Mich. Vol. ii. Pt. ii. Ch. viii. Sect. 6. p. 316.

it generally follows the Edition of Beza. The persons who superintended this Edition are altogether unknown; and, as they do not appear to have made use of any manuscript, their Edition is probably nothing more than a compilation from the preceding ones: but being printed in a neat form, and remarkable for its typographical accuracy, it was generally adopted as the basis of subsequent Editions, and has thence been denominated the Received Text.*

Since this period the number of manuscripts discovered and collated has surprizingly increased, so that in the present catalogues many are included of far greater antiquity and value than any of those on which the Received Text is founded. From these manuscripts critical Editions of the New Testament have been prepared by Mill, Kuster, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach and others.

With the Edition of Mill, which was published at Oxford in 1707, commenced a new era in the science of Biblical Criticism. He

* This Edition may be considered as the parent of the Text from which our authorized version is made. "It has acquired," says Bishop Marsh, (Mich. Vol. ii. p. 854. note 46.) "the title of Editio recepta, and the expression textus ab omnibus receptus, of which the editors boast in their preface, has been really prophetic. But that it deserves not the title of textus perfectus, is evident from the Critical Edition of Griesbach."

was the first editor of the Greek Testament who gave a clear and accurate description of the manuscripts which he consulted; and, though he copied without variation the third edition of Stephens, and did not venture to make the slightest change in the Text, his Prolegomena and Marginal Notes furnished subsequent editors with the means of doing effectually that which he must necessarily have left imperfect had he made the attempt. Mill is said to have collected from manuscripts, versions and fathers no less than thirty thousand various readings; and these were afterwards greatly increased by Kuster, who reprinted Mill's Edition at Rotterdam in 1710, and enriched it with the readings of twelve additional manuscripts.

In 1734 Bengel published, at Tubingen, an Edition of the Greek Testament, in which he altered the Received Text where he thought it capable of improvement, though his deference to public opinion prevented him from inserting in the Text any reading which had not already appeared in some printed Edition. His list of various readings, although taken principally from the Edition of Mill, was considerably enlarged by a collation of his own from manuscripts, versions and other authentic sources.

But Wetstein's Edition, which was published in 2 Vols. Folio, at Amsterdam, in 1751 and 1752, far surpasses those of his most eminent predecessors, and is of the greatest importance to every critic of the New Testament. His first design was to have adopted the Alexandrine Manuscript as the basis of his Edition. He then resolved to establish a Text of his own, formed on a comparison of the most ancient and valuable manuscripts. But his final determination was merely to reprint the Edition of the Elzevirs. Wetstein was an Antitrinitarian, and Michaëlis has, on this account, attempted to fix upon him the charge of partiality in judging of passages supposed to relate to the Divinity of Christ. But Bishop Marsh has, with much candour and good sense, repelled the ungenerous insinuation; proving that the decisions of Wetstein respecting such passages have been abundantly confirmed by the researches of later critics. The publication of Wetstein's Edition excited a general spirit of emulation among the literati of Europe; and in the years 1775 and 1777 the valuable Edition of Griesbach first made its appearance in two Vols. 8vo. In 1786 Professor Alter published the Text of the Vienna Manuscript in two Vols. 8vo., with various readings from other Greek Manuscripts, from the Coptic

and Slavonian Versions, and from two Latin Versions in the Imperial Library. Between the years 1782 and 1788 an Edition of the Greek Testament was prepared by Matthaï, in 12 Vols. 8vo., with various readings from several Moscow manuscripts. In 1788 Professor Birch of Copenhagen published a splendid Edition of the four Gospels in Folio and 4to. This work had the King of Denmark for its patron, and no expense was spared to procure various readings from the most important manuscripts in France, Spain, Germany and Italy. It follows the Text of Mill; and is chiefly valuable for its accurate and copious extracts from the Vatican Manuscript. But the second edition of Griesbach, published in the years 1796 and 1806, which contains the various readings of nearly four hundred manuscripts, and is enriched by extracts from the valuable publications of Alter, Matthaï and Birch, is incomparably superior to all preceding Editions.

The labours of Griesbach have been duly estimated and thankfully acknowledged by the liberal of all parties; and his Edition is now almost universally received as the standard Text of the Christian Scriptures. A writer in the

"Monthly Review"* has briefly summed up his merits as a critic in the following paragraph. "His profound comparative knowledge of manuscripts and editions, and the singular sagacity and impartiality of his verbal criticism, have given to his text of the Christian canon an oracular value. The orthodox and the heretic bow alike to the unprejudiced indifference of his dogmatism; and, where inspiration appears not to guide Griesbach is now allowed to determine." Butler, a liberal and enlightened Catholic, has spoken of his Edition of the New Testament in terms of the warmest admiration; and predicted that "it will become, like Heyne's Virgil, the general book of scholars, masters and literati."† And the present Bishop of Peterborough has thus briefly and correctly described it in his valuable translation of Michaëlis.‡ "Griesbach has admitted critical conjecture in no instance whatever, and where he has expunged, corrected or added, the evidence, (which he has accurately produced,) is, in point of authority, three and four-fold in his favour."

Such, then, is the character which all parties unite to bestow upon this unrivalled Edition of

---

* Vol. lxxiii. App. † Horæ Biblicæ. Vol. i. p. 163. ‡ Vol. ii. Pt. ii. p. 877. n. 2.

the Christian Scriptures. For its appearance under the form which it now wears we are in a great measure indebted to the late Duke of Grafton, an avowed and zealous Unitarian. Griesbach makes honourable mention of this circumstance in his Preface;* and Dr. Geddes, in an interesting letter to Eichhorn, alludes to it in terms of the highest commendation. "Dynasta, Griesbachii patronus, est Dux de Grafton, vir quidem bonarum literarum amantissimus, sed minime locuples. Fuit quondam Regis nostri minister primarius; sed diu est, quo curiæ valedixit; et nunc otio cum dignitate, sive rure sive urbe, fruitur. Is chartam Griesbachio suppeditavit pro certo numero exemplarium N. T. Græci: sed hæc exemplaria non omnia gratis distributa sunt. Plura sunt vendita, mediocri quidem pretio: sed tamen sunt vendita. Quoad Religionem, Dux est *Socinianus;* seu, ut nos loquimur, *Unitarianus:* liberalis tamen, siquis alius; et, ut verbo dicam, vere Christianus."† It appears, then, from

---

* N. T. Tom. i. p. ix.

† "The Nobleman who has patronized Griesbach is the Duke of Grafton; a great friend to sacred literature, but by no means wealthy. He was once Prime Minister to our King, but has long since bade adieu to the court, and now enjoys a dignified retirement, whether in town or country. He supplied Griesbach with paper for a certain number of copies of his Greek N. T.: these copies, however, were not all distributed free of expense. Many of them were sold; at a low price,

the above facts, that the purest specimen of the Sacred Text which has been published since the revival of learning, in the fifteenth century, was patronized by a Unitarian; and to the Unitarians, as a body, belongs the exclusive merit of having endeavoured to procure and publish a translation founded upon that Text.

The late Archbishop Newcome, whose orthodoxy was more than questionable on one or two particular subjects, "printed what he modestly calls 'An Attempt toward revising our English Translation of the Greek Scriptures,' in which he professes generally to follow the text of Griesbach." This Translation was adopted by the Editors of the "Improved Version" as the basis of their own; not, as some have insinuated, that the name of this respected prelate might operate as a sanction to the work; but on account of the "general accuracy, simplicity and fidelity" of the translation, and more particularly because the translator "professes to have followed the text of Griesbach." As this Text, however, is adopted only in part, and the Editors

---

indeed; but still they were sold. With regard to religious opinions the Duke is a *Socinian*, or, as we say, a *Unitarian;* but remarkably liberal, and, in one word, a true Christian." See Goode's life of Geddes, App. p. 544—547.

reserved to themselves the privilege of deviating from the Archbishop when they saw occasion, the two versions often differ materially from each other. Nor is there a perfect coincidence between the Text of the "Improved Version" and that of Griesbach; for it is not to be supposed that, amidst so many thousand various readings as the Edition of Griesbach exhibits, the selection which he has made should, in every instance, meet the approbation of his readers. If we compare his first and second editions, we shall find many instances in which he has improved upon himself; and may, therefore, conclude that many important alterations would still have been made, had his valuable life been spared, and his labours undergone another revision. In the few deviations which may be traced between the I. V. and the second edition of Griesbach, it will generally be found that the external evidence in favour of different readings is almost equally divided, and that the preponderance is determined by circumstances almost too minute for investigation. It may, perhaps, be adviseable, however, to enumerate some of the principal points of difference; and, that no room may be left for insinuation or conjecture, every passage shall be produced to which the most scrupulous person could attach the minutest degree of importance.

(1.) Matt. xxiii. 14.

Alas for you! scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers; therefore ye shall receive the greater condemnation. *Griesb.*	*Omitted by the Editors of the I. V.*

Griesbach transposes the 13th and 14th verses, on good evidence. The Editors of the I. V. on evidence equally strong, reject the 14th verse, and consider it as an interpolation from Mark xii. 40. and Luke xx. 47. Such interpolations are not unfrequent in the Gospels, owing to the injudicious attempts of transcribers to produce a strict and verbal agreement between passages in which the same facts are recorded by different evangelists. It may here, likewise, be mentioned that in several manuscripts called Lectionaria, which contain detached parts of the Gospels arranged in the form of lessons for the public service of the Church, passages are so interwoven with each other that it is often difficult to ascertain to which Gospel any particular reading should be referred.

(2.) John i. 14—18.

The common order of the verses is retained by Griesbach.	*The following transposition is adopted by the Editors of the I. V.* 14, 16, 17, 18, 15.

The connection of this passage seems to "require that the fifteenth verse should be placed between the eighteenth and nineteenth;" but, as there is no manuscript authority for this transposition, it would have been adviseable, perhaps, for the Editors of the I. V. to have retained the common order.

(3.) John xix. 4.

Now it was the preparation of the passover, and about the *sixth* hour. *Gr.*	Now it was the preparation-*day* of the passover, and about the *third* hour. *I. V.*

The reading of the I. V. appears to be the preferable one; and Griesbach, although he has not adopted it into his Text, has prefixed to it the mark of high probability. Nothing is more frequent in ancient MSS. than mistakes with regard to numbers; and here, as Newcome, with several of the ancient commentators, observes, "the Greek *episema*, or mark for *six*, and the *gamma*, or mark for *three*, might easily be confounded."

(4.) John xx. 8.

He saw and believed. *Gr.*	He saw and believed *not*. *I. V.*

The word "*not*" is here inserted by the Editors of the I. V. on the sole authority of the

Cambridge Manuscript; and, to justify this preference, we are told in the note that "the following verse assigns a reason for the *unbelief* of St. John and St. Peter." "For as yet they knew" or understood "not the scripture, that Jesus must rise again from the dead." But the difficulty may be removed, and another turn given to the passage by translating the verb in the pluperfect tense. "For they had not yet known" or understood "the scripture, &c." They had not known it before their visit to the sepulchre, but their minds were now more enlightened upon the subject; and, when they saw that the body of Jesus had disappeared, they were persuaded that he was risen from the dead. Opinions, however, are various; and, as no point of doctrine is involved in the passage, it is a matter of little importance whether we adopt the reading of the Cambridge Manuscript, or follow the Text of Griesbach.

(5.) Rom. iii. 25.

Whom God hath set forth as a mercy-seat *through faith* in his blood. *Gr.*	Whom God hath set forth as a mercy-seat in his *own* blood. (i. e. in the blood of Christ.) *I. V.*

The Editors of the I. V. have here omitted the words "through faith" upon what many would

no doubt pronounce slender and inconclusive evidence; and perhaps be inclined to dismiss as bordering too much upon the regions of conjecture. In this light, indeed, has the omission been considered by the Reviewer of the I. V. in a periodical work conducted and almost exclusively supported by Unitarians.* But the authorities upon which it depends, though not numerous, are far from being destitute of weight or respectability; and it is an acknowledged principle in Biblical Criticism that the genuineness of a reading is not to be determined by the quantity so much as the internal character of the manuscripts in which it is found. *Ponderandi, non numerandi testes.* Griesbach, presuming upon the correctness of this principle, of which he was convinced from long experience and accurate observation, has divided the manuscripts of the N. T. into three classes, which he calls the Alexandrine, the Western and the Constantinopolitan or Byzantine Recensions.† The Alexandrine Recension, he tell us, exhibits the readings of Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, and was adopted and disseminated by the Alexandrine and Egyptian

* Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature. Vol. iv. p. 158.

† Nov. Test. Proleg. p. lxxv—lxxviii. Lond. Ed. 1809.—Symbolæ Criticæ. Tom. i. p. cxvii—cxxii. Tom. ii. p. 621—640.

Fathers: the readings of the Western Recension are found principally in the old Latin Version, the works of Tertullian, Cyprian and the other Latin Fathers who flourished in Africa, Italy, Gaul and other parts of the West: and the Byzantine Recension is generally found in the writings of those Fathers who lived in Greece, Asia-Minor and the neighbouring provinces. To these Michaëlis adds a fourth, which he calls the Edessene,* and which comprehends that class of Greek manuscripts from which the old Syriac Version was made, but of which there are no remaining copies in the present day. Now Griesbach informs us that the Alexandrine MS., which omits the words "through faith" in the above passage, affords a pure specimen of the Alexandrine Recension in the epistles of Paul:† and the Text of Chrysostom, in which

---

* Introd. Vol. ii. Pt. i. Ch. viii. Sect. 3. p. 176.

† The manuscripts quoted by Griesbach, with the exception of eight or nine, contain only parts of the N. T., and are divided into the following Classes. (1.) The Gospels: (2.) the Epistles of Paul: (3.) the Acts and Catholic Epistles: and (4.) the Apocalypse. The original cause of this division I conceive to have been as follows. Before the invention of printing the expense of transcription was so great that a MS. Copy of the whole of the N. T. seldom found a purchaser. Religious houses were considered rich in the possession of such a treasure; and it was only an individual here and there whose means enabled him to procure an entire copy of the Sacred Scriptures. It became necessary, therefore, to class the different books, and publish them separately, for the convenience of

we find the same omission, is often closely allied to that of the old Syriac Version, or Edessene Recension; either, as Griesbach conjectures,* from his having consulted the writings of the ancient interpreters, or more probably because he was a native of Cœle-Syria and Presbyter of Antioch.† But, being afterwards elected to preside over the see of Constantinople, his readings sometimes agree with those of the *ancient* Byzantine Recension.‡ That the existing MSS. of the Syriac Version and the Byzantine Recension favour the common reading are facts which I shall not presume to deny: but let it be recollected that the Syriac Version, however excellent in itself, cannot be supposed to exhibit a com-

---

those who were unable to purchase the whole: and hence arose the forementioned division. The MSS. containing these detached portions of Scripture probably exhibited, in the first instance, tolerable specimens of the Recensions of the country in which they were written; but, when two or more were united, it frequently happened, from various causes which it is now unnecessary to specify, that the same MS. partook of the readings of different Recensions. Thus, the Alexandrine MS. follows the readings of the Byzantine in the Gospels, of the Western in the Acts and Catholic Epistles, and of *the Alexandrine in the Epistles of Paul.* See Griesbach's Symb. Crit. Vol. i. p. ix.

* N. T. Proleg. p. lxxvi. † Socratis Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. Cap. ii. iii.

‡ "Since many alterations were unavoidably made, in the series of years that elapsed between the fourth and fifteenth centuries, we may divide the Byzantine edition into the ancient, and the modern." Mich. Introd. Vol. ii. Chap. viii. Sect. 3. p. 177.

plete and immaculate specimen of the Edessene Text; and that the Byzantine Recension was in a state of much greater purity when Chrysostom wrote than it was a century or two afterwards, and is so far preferable to the Text contained in the most ancient Greek MSS., none of which can boast of a date prior to the fifth century. After all, however, I have nothing to object to the reading of Griesbach, except that it has too much the appearance, as he himself confesses, of an interpolation. "Nulla enim apparet omissionis causa; addi vero potuit coll. comm. 22. ad declarandum sensum verborum, etc."* To me, indeed, it appears immaterial, as far as doctrine is concerned, whether we reject or retain the words "through faith." Read them parenthetically, and not a syllable of the interpretation given by the Editors of the I. V. will require amendment or revision. The passage will then stand as follows. "Whom God hath set forth as a mercy-seat, (through faith,†) in his blood."

---

* Symb. Crit. Tom. ii. p. 116.

† Since writing the above I find that I have been anticipated by Dr. Carpenter in proposing to read the words "through faith," or, "by means of faith," parenthetically.—"What has principally contributed to obscure the meaning of this highly-interesting passage, is, that the words, *by means of faith*, have been connected with what follows, *in his*, or, *his own*, *blood*, —and, that *just* is supposed to be placed in opposition to the clause following, *the justifier*, &c. With respect to the former, I

(6.) 1 Cor. x. 9.

Nor let us tempt *Christ.* *Gr.*	Nor let us try the *the Lord,* *I. V.*

The word "Lord" is adopted, in this passage, on the authority of the Vatican and Ephrem MSS. Griesbach retains "Christ," the reading of the R. T., but not without considerable hesitation. The weight of evidence certainly appears to favour the reading of the I. V.

(7.) 1 Cor. xv. 47.

The second man *the Lord* from heaven. *Gr.*	The second man from heaven [heavenly,] *I. V.*

The word "Lord" is wanting in the Vatican, Ephrem, Clermont and many other MSS., as well as in some of the most ancient Versions and Fathers; and Griesbach prefixes to it the mark of probable omission. The word "heavenly" is found in two MSS. written in uncial letters about the ninth or tenth century; but is, in all probability, a marginal gloss, explanatory of the words

---

have only to remark, that the expression, *faith in the blood of Christ*, is no where else to be found,—that if it were, as it must mean, generally, *faith in the beneficial effects of his death*, it determines nothing as to the precise nature of those effects,—and that to consider the words, *by means of faith*, as parenthetical, is an interpretation peculiarly suitable to the Apostle's positions, and completes the allusion to the real mercy-seat,"—Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel. Ch. ix. p. 316.

" from heaven." This conjecture derives support from the insertion of the article before the word " heavenly," which is omitted in the corresponding part of the preceding clause, and which renders it necessary to translate the passage thus. " The first man is from the earth, earthy; the second man is from heaven, [the heavenly one.]"

The above, I feel no hesitation in saying, are all the passages of importance in which the I. V. leaves the Text of Griesbach. Only one of these passages can be supposed to have any relation to doctrine; (Rom. iii. 25.) and even that, as we have seen, may be rationally and consistently explained upon the Unitarian hypothesis, whether we adopt the Text of Griesbach or follow that of the I. V. In any case, however, let not the advocates of the Received Text charge the Editors with interpolating and omitting passages to favour their own opinions; for they are of all persons the last from whom such a charge can consistently proceed. Compare, for instance, the Text of Griesbach and that of the Received Translation, in the following passages, together with the evidence by which each is supported, and say whether this assertion is not abundantly confirmed by the fact.

(1.) Acts xx. 28.

To feed the Church of *the Lord* which he hath purchased with his own blood. *Gr.*	To feed the Church of *God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood. *R. T.*

(2.) Eph. iii. 9.

The mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hidden in God, who created all things. *Gr.*	The mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things *by Jesus Christ*. *R. T.*

(3.) 1. Tim. iii. 16.

He who was manifested in the flesh. *Gr.*	*God* was manifest in the flesh. *R. T.*

(4.) 1 John iii. 16.

Hereby perceive we love, because he laid down his life for us. *Gr.*	Hereby perceive we *the love of God*,* because he laid down his life for us. *R. T.*

(5.) 1 John v. 7, 8.

	For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three

---

* "In some of our English Bibles, the words—*of God*—are in *Italics*, to denote that there is nothing answering to them in the original; in others they are in Roman type, as if they were a bona-fide translation." Aspland's Plea for Unitarian Dissenters. 12mo. Ed. p. 22.

For there are three that bear testimony, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. *Gr.*	are one.* And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. *R. T.*

These, you will acknowledge, are the passages from which Trinitarianism derives its main support; and I doubt whether another could be found equally favourable to that system, if you were to search the New Testament from the first chapter of Matthew to the last page of Revelation. Such, then, is the triumph of fair and

---

* In the following Note, subjoined by the Editors of the I. V. to this passage, the evidence against it is fairly and accurately stated. "1. This text concerning the heavenly witnesses is not contained in any Greek manuscript which was written earlier than the fifteenth century. 2. Nor in any Latin manuscript earlier than the ninth century. 3. It is not found in any of the ancient versions. 4. It is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical writers, though to prove the doctrine of the Trinity they have cited the words both before and after this text. 5. It is not cited by any of the early Latin fathers, even when the subjects upon which they treat would naturally have led them to appeal to its authority. 6. It is first cited by Vigilius Tapsensis, a Latin writer of no credit, in the latter end of the fifth century, and by him it is suspected to have been forged. 7. It has been omitted as spurious in many editions of the New Testament since the Reformation:—in the two first of Erasmus, in those of Aldus, Colinæus, Zwinglius, and lately of Griesbach. 8. It was omitted by Luther in his German version. In the old English Bibles of Henry VIII. Edward VI. and Elizabeth, it was printed in small types, or included in brackets: but between the years 1566 and 1580 it began to be printed as it now stands; by whose authority, it is not known. See Travis's Letters to Gibbon, and Porson's to Travis. Also, Griesbach's excellent Dissertation on the Text at the end of his second volume. Abp. Newcome omits the text, and the Bishop of Lincoln expresses his conviction that it is spurious. Elem. of Theol. vol ii. p. 90, note."

impartial criticism; but, although Unitarians have abundant cause to rejoice in its effects, they are too conscious of the little share which they have had in producing them, to arrogate any part of the merit to themselves. Semler, who first suggested the idea of distributing the MSS. of the New Testament into Families or Recensions, was a Trinitarian. Griesbach who pursued the idea, and gave a practical exemplification of its correctness, was a Trinitarian. Michaëlis, who has adopted the same idea in his valuable "Introduction to the New Testament," was a Trinitarian; and his able translator, the present Bishop of Peterborough, and a strenuous disciple of the Griesbachian school, is both by education and profession a Trinitarian. The majority of learned orthodox writers, indeed, have acknowledged the corrupt state of the Received Text, and given a verbal sanction to the amended Text of Griesbach; or at least to the principles upon which it is founded. But the time, I apprehend, is far distant when these principles, which are deemed so admirable in theory, will be applied, under the sanction of episcopal authority, to the formation of a purer Text than the one now in common use. "The Athenians *know* what is right; but the Lacedemonians *practise* it."

Besides the passages already mentioned, in which the Editors of the I. V. leave the Text of Griesbach, there are a few, and among these the preliminary chapters to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which they have printed in the Italic character, " to indicate that they are of doubtful authority." The degrees of doubt in these instances are various, and the ground of it is not always the same. The passages themselves, however, are retained without a single omission or alteration; they occupy their usual place in the books of which they form a part; and the sense of the original is always faithfully preserved in the translation. The following are, I believe, the only examples of this kind which occur. Mat. i. 17—ii. 23. Luke i. 5—ii. 52. xxii. 43. 44. xxiii. 43. John v. 4. vii. 53—viii. 11. and 2 Peter ii.

With regard to Mat. i. 17—ii. 23. it cannot be denied that the external evidence is decidedly in favour of its authenticity; nor do the Editors of the I. V. attempt to deny this. They inform their readers, on the contrary, that it is " to be found in all the manuscripts and versions which are now extant;" adding, however, on the combined testimony of Epiphanius and Jerome, that it was " wanting in the copies used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, that is, by the ancient

Hebrew Christians; for whose instruction, probably, the Gospel of Matthew was originally written." Now Bishop Marsh has attempted to prove, and, in my opinion, has succeeded in proving that Matthew, Mark and Luke used copies of a common Hebrew document, the materials of which Matthew who wrote in Hebrew retained in the language in which he found them:* but he admits that this document did not contain what is related in Mat. i. ii.† It appears probable, therefore, that these chapters were prefixed to the Gospel of Matthew not by the Evangelist himself, as the annotator of Michaëlis supposes, but by his translator, or some early scribe. That they are quoted, indeed, by Origen and Clemens Alexandrinus, and that they were likewise known to Celsus the great enemy of the Christian religion in the second century, are clear and undisputed facts;‡ nor is it unreasonable to suppose that they were reckoned a part of Matthew's Gospel even earlier than this. But we know that forgeries of various kinds existed in the very age of the apostles,‖ when they were far less easy of detection than they would now be on account of the facility

* Dissertation on the Origin, &c. of the three first Gospels. Chap. xv.

† Mich. Introd. Vol. iii. Pt. ii. p. 140. ‡ Griesbachii Symb. Crit. Tom. ii. p. 241.

‖ Jones's New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the N. T. Vol. i. Pt. i. Chap. ii.

of multiplying copies by the invention of printing. We may infer, likewise, that the passage under consideration would be peculiarly acceptable to many of the early converts as tending to exalt the character of Jesus by taking away the reproach of his mean birth and parentage.

The introductory narrative to the Gospel of Luke (i. 5—ii. 52.) is supported, like the preceding, by the whole body of manuscripts and versions now extant; but was wanting in the copy of Marcion, a Christian writer of unimpeached integrity, who flourished near the beginning of the second century, and who contended that *his* was the only genuine Gospel of Luke. Tertullian, however, whose copy differed from that of Marcion, and was in substance the same with the one which now forms a part of the Received Canon, is equally positive in denying the genuineness of Marcion's copy, and asserting the purity of his own. "Ego meum dico verum, Marcion suum. Ego Marcionis adfirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit?"* Thus stood the question when Tertullian wrote (A. D. 183.); and, notwithstanding the various discussions which it has since undergone, an umpire

* Tertul. adv. Marcion. Lib. iv. c. 3.

has not yet been found sufficiently learned and candid to balance the arguments on both sides, and pronounce a satisfactory and decisive judgment upon the subject. Our appeal then must be made to the narrative itself; and, if style is allowed to be any criterion in such a case, the difference between that of the introductory chapters and the body of Luke's Gospel will decidedly turn the balance in favour of Marcion. Of this I trust you will soon be convinced from the comparison now about to be instituted.

Nothing was more common in the forgeries of the early Christians than to string together a number of incidents from genuine Scripture, in order to conceal the fraud, or render detection more difficult. Accordingly on examining these chapters I look in vain for that clear and beautiful connection which distinguishes the other parts of the Evangelical records. The narrative is almost entirely made up of passages extracted from the Old Testament; and is eked out far beyond the usual limits, with speeches and quotations, in which forged histories generally abound. The first idea of this extraordinary story was suggested, according to the opinion of some, by a tradition respecting the birth of Pythagoras, recorded in his life by Jamblichus.

This writer says, that "when the mother of Pythagoras was with child of him, her husband being ignorant of her pregnancy, brought her to the oracle at Delphi, and there the prophetess told him the first news of his wife's having conceived, and also that the child she then went with, should prove the greatest blessing to mankind; that her husband thereupon changed her name from Parthenis to Pythias, and, when the child was born, named him Pytharogas, as being foretold by Apollo Pythius, for so, says he, the name signifies; and adds, that there can be no doubt, but that the soul of that child was one of Apollo's companions in heaven, and came down by commission from him."* But whether this is the true origin of the story respecting the miraculous conception; or whether it was suggested, as is more probable, by the miraculous births mentioned in the Old Testament,† is quite immaterial. When the plan was once conceived, the execution was not difficult. The command of Pharaoh to drown all the male children of the Israelites appears to have furnished an outline for the slaughter of the infants, which the compiler of the narrative prefixed to Matthew's Gospel has filled up with admirable dexterity and skill.

---

* Cumberland's Observer. Vol. i. No. 8. † See Gen. xvii. 15—19, xxi. 1, 2. Judg. xiii. 1 Sam. i.

Exodus.	Matthew.
i. 22. And Pharaoh charged all his people, saying, Every son that is born ye shall cast into the River, and every daughter shall ye save alive.	ii. 16. Then Herod sent forth, and slew all the male children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under. &c.

The flight into Egypt, with its accompanying circumstances, appears likewise to have been borrowed from the flight of Moses into the land of Midian.

Exodus.	Matthew.
ii. 15. Now when Pharaoh heard this thing, he sought to slay Moses. But Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian.	ii. 13. Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. 14. Then he arose, and took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt.
iv. 19. And the Lord said unto Moses in Midian, Go, return into Egypt: for all the men are dead which sought thy life.	19. But when Herod was dead, behold an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, 20. saying, Arise and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: for they are dead which sought the young child's life.
20. And Moses took his wife, and his sons, and set them upon an ass, and he returned to the land of Egypt.	21. And he arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel.

Nor is it less evident that many expressions in

the narrative prefixed to Luke's Gospel are taken from the account of Samuel's birth, and the circumstances attending his early life. The song of Mary (Luke i. 46—55.) is little else than an imitation of that of Hannah; (i. Sam. ii. 1—10.) which proves that the compiler of the narrative had this portion of Scripture in view when he wrote. But that this is not the only point of resemblance you will instantly perceive from the following comparison.

1 Samuel.	Luke.
i. 24. And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her, with three bullocks, and one ephah of flour, and a bottle of wine, and brought him unto the house of the Lord in Shiloh.	ii. 22. And when the days of her purification, according to the laws of Moses, were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord, 24, and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons.
iii. 19. And Samuel grew, and the Lord was with him.	40. And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him.
i. 3. And this man went up out of his city yearly, to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of hosts in Shiloh.	41. Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year, at the feast of the passover.
ii. 26. And the child Samuel grew on, and was in favour both with the Lord, and also with men.	52. And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.

Thus, then, the very style of these narratives, independently of every other consideration, fixes upon them at once strong marks of suspicion, and renders it highly probable that they were originally unconnected with the genuine Gospels of Matthew and Luke. That the phraseology of the Evangelists, indeed, contains expressions borrowed from the Jewish Scriptures, is a position which no one will presume to deny; but that these Evangelists have, in any instance, followed the writers of the Old Testament through long passages, and studiously adopted their phrases and idioms in a recital of plain facts, is what I am neither authorized nor inclined to believe concerning them. Poverty of style and barrenness of invention have been justly ranked among the characteristics of fraud and error observable in the spurious writings of the first and second centuries; "since with the greatest latitude of fiction, and the most flagrant violation of truth, the compilers are perpetually borrowing incidents from other sources—from the pure stream of sacred truth, as well as the polluted current of heathen fiction."* But in the genuine writings of the New Testament we perceive nothing which is calculated to excite

* Maltby's Illustrations of the Truth of the Christian Religion. Chap. i. p. 49.

suspicion or disgust: we discover no traces of art: we meet with no laboured attempts to magnify what is in itself unimportant and frivolous. The narrative is consistent and entire in all its parts, and forms a direct contrast to the puny and abortive efforts of imposture.

I proceed, however, to state other objections to which these passages are liable, and which greatly tend to counterbalance the weight of external evidence in their favour.

(1.) First, then, the date of the enrolment, mentioned in Luke ii. 1, 2. is a great historical difficulty. "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed: and this taxing was made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria." Now the census here spoken of is mentioned by none of the contemporary heathen historians, a fact which renders the whole story highly suspicious. It must have taken place, moreover, if it even happened at all, when Herod was king of Judea; and, consequently, when the Roman emperor had no power to issue such a decree with regard to Judea. But, what is of still greater importance to our present argument, Cyrenius was not constituted governor of

Syria till at least ten years after the birth of Jesus.*

(2.) But, again, we read (Luke iii. 1. comp. 23.) that Jesus began to be about thirty years of age in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar. "He must, therefore," as the Editors of the I. V. observe,† "have been born fifteen years before the death of Augustus, A. U. C. 752 or 753: but the latest period assigned for the death of Herod is the spring of A. U. C. 751, and he died, probably, the year before. Herod therefore must have been dead upwards of two years before Christ was born."

(3.) Another objection to these passages is that they sometimes directly contradict each other. Thus, according to the narrative prefixed to Matthew's Gospel, Jesus was visited immediately after his birth by *Magians,* who came from some *distant country Eastward* of Bethlehem, (comp. ii. 1 and 12.) and found him with his mother

---

* "Certum est, Cyrenium tum, quum Christus nasceretur, nondum fuisse præsidem Syriæ. Functus est hoc munere tum temporis Sentius Saturninus: Saturnino autem Quinctilius Varus successit, et huic denique Sulpit. Quirinus." Ernesti Inst. Interp. N. T. Ammon. Pars i. Sect. ii. Cap. vi. § 3.

† Note to Luke i. 4.

in a house at that place (vs. 11.): but, according to the account given us in the second chapter of Luke, these Magians from the East were *shepherds* who kept watch over their flocks in the immediate *neighbourhood of Bethlehem* (Luke ii. 8.); and who found Jesus *in a stall* or *manger*, (φατνῃ*) in which he had been laid by his mother, (vs. 16.) because they had been unable to procure lodgings at the inn. (vs. 7.)—We are further told (Luke ii. 22.) that, when the days of Mary's purification were accomplished,† the parents of Jesus "brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord;" and (vs. 39.) that "when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth" But we read, on the other hand, (Mat. ii. 13.) that, after the departure of the wise men from Bethlehem, "Joseph

---

* This φατνῃ is mentioned in the 12th verse without any particular emphasis, and there it wants the article. "Ye shall find *a babe* wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in *a manger*." But the article of reference is prefixed both to βρεφος and φατνῃ in the 16th verse. "They came with haste, and found Mary and Joseph; and *the babe*, lying in *the manger*." They delayed not to make the necessary inquiries, and found the mother and her infant still destitute of comfortable accommodation: not "in a house," as the account prefixed to Matthew's Gospel affirms, but in the identical "stall" or "manger," which they had occupied from the beginning.

† Thirty-three days after the birth. See Lev. xii. 4.

was warned of God in a dream to flee into Egypt;" (vs. 14.) that he actually withdrew thither with his family for the purpose of escaping the effects of Herod's decree; and that it was not till his return from Egypt (vs. 23.) that "he came and dwelt in the city called Nazareth." Now, on comparing these two accounts, it is natural to inquire how and when this pretended flight into Egypt took place. It could not have been from Nazareth, if the latter account be true; nor could it have been from Bethlehem, if any degree of credit be due to the former; because every moment which elapsed between the birth of Jesus and his being conveyed to Nazareth by his parents, is there accurately accounted for. If, therefore, it took place at all, it must have resembled the miraculous flight of Pythagoras, who is said, by Porphyry and Jamblichus, to have been, on one and the same day, at Metapontum in Italy, and Taurominium in Sicily.*

(4.) But, lastly, these passages are not only at variance with historical truth, and inconsistent with each other: they are likewise opposed to various expressions and statements which we find in the true Gospel narratives.

---

* See Bentley's Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris. p. 180.

It must be obvious to every attentive reader of the New Testament that, with exception only to these passages, Nazareth was uniformly considered as the birth place of Jesus. See Mat. xxi. 11. Luke iv. 34. xviii. 37. xxiv. 19. and various other places in the Gospels of Mark and John, as well as the Acts of the Apostles, in which he is styled *Jesus of Nazareth;* doubtless to intimate that he was born there. Thus, for instance, when we say *Saul of Tarsus,* we use an epithet descriptive of that particular individual whose name was Saul, and who was born at Tarsus in Cilicia; and, when we say *William of Wickham,* we allude to a certain distinguished person of the name of William, who was born at Wickham in Hampshire. But what says the writer of the narrative prefixed to Matthew's Gospel? He " came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, ' He shall be called a Nazarene.'" Mat. ii. 23.—By what prophets was it ever said that he should be so called? By the Jewish prophets? Certainly not; for there is no such passage to be found in any of their writings: and, if the Jewish prophets are not meant, I am totally at a loss to conjecture whom this unknown and mysterious writer intended to describe by this appellation. The truth, my dear Friend, appears to be this. Beth-

lehem was fixed upon as the birth-place of Jesus, to obviate the difficulty which was felt by those who expected that the Messiah should be born there; and, when that object was successfully accomplished, it was only to convey Jesus to Nazareth and assign something like a reason for his being called *Jesus of Nazareth* in preference to *Jesus of Bethlehem*, and the deception, it was then thought, would be complete. But it is clear enough that we should never have heard of Bethlehem in this connection, had it not been for the existence of a prophecy in the Jewish Scriptures, from which it was erroneously inferred that this was to be the native place of the Messiah. Of this prophecy the Magians appear not to have been informed* (Mat. ii. 1, 2.); nor could Herod satisfy their inquiries as to the place of the expected Messiah's birth, till he had called together a council of the chief priests and scribes, who pointed out to him the above-mentioned prophecy. The anxiety to give this prophecy a literal fulfilment, as I have already observed, was evidently the reason why the compiler of this narrative placed the seat of our Lord's nativity in Bethlehem; and if any of the Jews of

* The same Magians under the disguise of shepherds wanted no such information. See Luke ii. 11, 15. This should have been intimated under the last head, but it accidentally escaped the writer's notice.

that period had been asked the question which Herod proposed to the chief priests and scribes, they would doubtless have given a similar reply. Thus, on a certain occasion we are told that "many of the people, when they heard his sayings, exclaimed, 'Of a truth, this is *the Prophet.*' Others said, 'This is *the Christ.*' But some said, '*Shall Christ come out of Galilee?** Hath not the Scripture said, that *Christ cometh* of the seed of David, and *out of the town of Bethlehem,*† where David was?' So there was a division among the people because of him." John vii. 40—43.—The truth is that these infatuated men did not understand their own Scriptures. We read in the Old Testament, (Deut. xviii. 15.) "The Lord thy God will will raise up unto thee *a prophet* from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken, &c.:" and hence the Jews in after times concluded that some particular personage was alluded to in this promise, whom they called, by way of eminence, *the Prophet.* But that the passage requires a very different interpretation is abundantly evident from the context, (9—14. 18—22.) where

---

* Nazareth was a city of Galilee, about 60 miles North of Jerusalem.

† Bethlehem was a town of Judæa, about 6 miles South-West of Jerusalem.

the Israelites are strictly prohibited from having recourse to false prophets, and enjoined to attend to the words of *that prophet* only whose credentials are well attested. A moment's consideration, my dear Friend, will convince you that no particular individual is glanced at in this passage, but that allusion is made to the long and unbroken succession of true prophets with which the Jewish nation was honoured from Moses downward to Malachi. It was by a similar mistake that the Jews were led to infer that their Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem. "Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?" John vii. 42.—It is true the Scripture had said, "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be the ruler of Israel." Micah. v. 2.—This passage, which occurs in the midst of a prophecy relating to the Babylonish Captivity, Grotius applies to Zerubbabel, who was a Bethlehemite by descent; but it is supposed by the author of the narrative prefixed to Matthew's Gospel to have been written with reference to the Messiah. Now allowing this assumption to be a correct one, though the point is at best somewhat dubious, the prophecy would

have received its accomplishment wherever Christ had been born, provided he was born of the seed of David; for Bethlehem would still, in one sense, have had the honour of his birth. Language is often applied remotely to the posterity, which if strictly interpreted, ought to be confined to the individual from whom that posterity sprang; and to say that Jesus came forth from Bethlehem, because it was the birth-place of his ancestor David, appears to me, I confess, no greater violation of the rules of language, than to call him *the son*, when he was in fact only *a very remote descendant*, of David.

But the authors of these narratives, not content with fixing upon Bethlehem as the native town of Jesus, have thought proper likewise to state, regardless of the most express assertions to the contrary, that he was born out of the usual course of nature; or, in other words, that he had no human father, and that his descent from David was a mere fiction. Now the genealogy prefixed to Matthew's Gospel is entitled (i. 1.) "The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham;" and its professed object is to trace down the line of ancestry from Abraham, through David and Joseph, to Jesus who was called the Christ. In

like manner, the pedigree given by Luke, though differing widely from that of Matthew, appears to have been written with precisely the same object, and professes to trace the origin of Jesus, through Joseph, David and Abraham, in a direct line to Adam the original father of us all. Some, I am aware, have inferred from the words "being (as was supposed, *or* as was allowed by law,) the son of Joseph," (Luke iii. 23.) that doubts existed in the mind of the Evangelist whether he was in reality such. But it appears to me impossible that any prudent and sensible writer should have been at the trouble of compiling a genealogy like this, if he had thought that Jesus was only the adopted son of Joseph; for in this case it would have been just as much to the purpose, if we had been furnished with the genealogy of Zacharias or Simeon, as with that of Joseph. Besides, if we have recourse to the language of the Apostles and others, as recorded in the genuine writings of Scripture, we shall find passages in which Jesus is said to be literally and emphatically the son of Joseph, and the descendant of David. What, for instance, was the language of the inhabitants of Nazareth, and those who attended upon the ministry of Jesus at Capernaum? "Is not this *the son of the carpenter?*" Mat. xiii. 55.

(See also Luke iv. 22.) "Is not this *Jesus the son of Joseph*, whose father and mother we know?" John vi. 42.—What said Nathanael to Philip when he invited him to a personal interview with Jesus? "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, *Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.*" John i. 45.—What said the apostle Paul in the synagogue at Antioch, in allusion to the patriarch David? "*Of this man's seed* hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel *a Saviour, Jesus.*" Acts xiii. 23.—And finally, what said Peter at Jerusalem, on the memorable day of Pentecost, in the presence of an assembled multitude consisting of Jews and devout men out of every nation under heaven? "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day: therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that *God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ*, to sit upon his throne: he, seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ." Acts ii. 29—31. On reviewing these passages, my dear Friend, two things are evident: first, that Jesus was regarded by his countrymen as the legitimate descendant of Joseph: and, secondly, that the apostles Peter

and Paul considered him, in the obvious and literal sense of the phrase, a descendant of David. With such testimony before us, then (whatever prepossessions we may be disposed to entertain respecting the doctrine of the Miraculous Conception,) we are bound by every principle of reason and common sense to reject the narratives in which it is taught, as exhibiting decisive marks of imposture, and abounding in the most palpable violations of truth and consistency. Not, indeed, that there is in the mere matter of fact that Jesus was miraculously conceived any thing really hostile to the principles of Unitarianism. It is only on grounds such as those already stated that the Editors of the I. V. have been led to suspect the genuineness of the passages from which this doctrine is derived, or that I have been induced to undertake their defence. The miraculous birth of Isaac, while it served to establish the truth of the divine promises, (Heb. xi. 11.) did not confer upon that eminent individual any superiority of nature, or exalt him in the slightest degree above his fellows. Nor would the miraculous conception of Jesus, accompanied, as it might have been, by the strongest internal marks of truth, and recorded by the pen of inspiration itself, have had even the remotest bearing upon the controversy respecting his divine nature.

The next passage which demands our consideration is Luke xxii. 43, 44. "*And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him. And, being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.*" This passage, like those to which our attention was last directed, contains no sentiment or expression at variance with the principles of Unitarianism. It appears rather to favour the idea that Jesus was, in the strictest sense, a human being; and presents him to our view under a character totally inconsistent with the attributes and perfections of Godhead. Dr. Priestley says, "it is a proof both of the most exquisite sensibility of his mind, and of his entire resignation to the will of God:"* and Dr. Carpenter, in summing up the evidence of Luke concerning the nature of our Saviour, enumerates the circumstance recorded in this passage among the "facts of high interest respecting his character and *humanity*."† It seems improbable, therefore, that any motive but a disinterested love of truth should have prevailed with the Editors of the I. V. to consider it as a passage of doubtful anthority. Accordingly, we

* Notes on the Bible. Vol. iii., p. 484.

† Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel. Pt. i. Ch. ii. p. 26.

are informed in a note subjoined at the bottom of the page, that "these verses are wanting in the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and other manuscripts, and are marked as doubtful in some in which they are inserted." This statement, however, must be received with some qualification. The Vatican and Alexandrine manuscripts agree, it is true, in omitting the passage; but this agreement, under the peculiar circumstances in which it occurs, is very lightly estimated by the author of a critical description of the Vatican manuscript, inserted in a German periodical publication,* and mentioned in terms of the highest praise by the translator of Michaëlis.† "With the Codex A. (Alexandrinus) the Vatican manuscript seldom agrees, and in characteristic readings hardly in any instance, if we except the omission of Luke xxii. 43, 44. where the Vatican deviates from its usual track, and forms an unnatural coalition with the Alexandrine manuscript; but this very circumstance weakens the authority, to which it would be otherwise entitled in regard to this passage."—Of the "other manuscripts" in which it is said to be wanting, only three are enumerated by Griesbach, (13, 69 and 124.) in two of

* Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung for 1789, Vol. i. p. 237.

† Vol. ii. Pt. ii. p. 810.

which (69 and 124) it is inserted after Mat. xxvi. 39.—All the Evangelistaria adopt a similar arrangement of this passage, omitting it in the lesson contained between Luke xxii. 36. and xxiii. 1., but inserting it in the corresponding lesson of Matthew's Gospel. (xxvi. 2—xxvii. 2.) In justice, however, to the other side of the question, it should be observed, that these verses did not exist in certain Latin and Greek manuscripts alluded to by Epiphanius, Hilary and Jerome; that they are marked as doubtful in several of the manuscripts in which they are contained; and that they are not found in the codex brixiensis, one of the most famous manuscripts of the old Latin Version.

The fourth passage which the Editors of the I. V. have printed in the Italic character is Luke xxiii. 43. "*And Jesus said to him, 'Verily I say unto thee, To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise.'*" Of the ground of suspicion with regard to the above passage we are informed in a note, which I shall here take the liberty of transcribing. "This verse was wanting in the copies of Marcion and other reputed heretics; and in some of the older copies in the time of Origen: nor is it cited either by Justin, Irenæus or Tertullian; though the two former have quoted

almost every text in Luke which relates to the crucifixion; and Tertullian wrote concerning the intermediate state." The evidence against the genuineness of this passage is here stated in a concise but emphatical manner. Epiphanius informs us that it was wanting in the copies of Marcion; Chrysostom that it was not found in those of the Manicheans; and Origen that many in his time suspected it to be an interpolation. It seems improbable, moreover, that Justin and Irenæus, if they had regarded it as a part of Luke's Gospel, should have altogether overlooked it amidst the profusion of quotations which they have made from the writings of this Evangelist. Nor is it possible that Tertullian, if it existed in his copies, should have abstained from all mention of it, unless we suppose that the common interpretation was unknown to him. Some have thought, as you are probably aware, that *this day* refers to *the time when the promise was made*, and not to the promise itself; as if Jesus had said, "At this very time, notwithstanding my present circumstances of disgrace and humiliation, yet *even now* I promise, that in due time thou shalt be with me in paradise:" and Griesbach notices this construction as plausible and worthy of attention. Others, again, have argued that *this day*, in Scriptural language,

often denotes *the certainty of an event*, without reference to the particular time in which it occurs. Compare, for instance, Deut. ix. 1. with Joshua i. 1, 2, 10, 11; iii. 1—5. and see Psalm ii. 7. and Acts xiii. 33. Now if Tertullian adopted either of these interpretations, it would not necessarily come within the plan of his treatise to quote this text: but, otherwise, his not having quoted it greatly increases the probability that it was absent from his copies. It appears, then, that the Editors of the I. V. were not altogether unwarranted in marking it as a passage of doubtful authority; although it will perhaps admit of a question whether the evidence is sufficient to justify the use of the Italic character.

The fifth passage which the Editors have marked as suspicious, by printing it in the above character, is John v. 4. together with the last clause of the preceding verse.* It relates to the moving of the water in the pool of Bethesda by an angel; and the evidence against it is so strong that Griesbach has prefixed to it his mark of probable omission. It is likewise regarded as

---

* "*Looking for the moving of the water. For at a certain season an angel went down into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever therefore went in first, after the troubling of the water, was made well, whatever disease he had.*"

spurious by Semler, Michaëlis and Marsh; and, as the observations of the last of these writers respecting it afford some insight into the usual progress by which false readings become established as genuine parts of the books of Scripture, it may not be amiss to transcribe them in this place. "The Codex Ephrem has many marginal notes written in uncial letters. This proves what has been sometimes doubted, that marginal notes were made in the most ancient manuscripts, and that this practice prevailed in the early ages of Christianity. It is likewise remarkable that in this manuscript the disputed, or rather spurious verse John v. 4. is written not in the text, but as a marginal scholion. Now as this verse is totally omitted in the Codex Bezæ, (or Cambridge Manuscript,) and the Codex Vaticanus, which are the two most ancient MSS. now extant; is likewise omitted in the text of the Codex Ephrem, (which is somewhat inferior in age to the Codex Bezæ,) but written in the margin as a scholion; is written in more modern manuscripts in the text itself, but marked with an asterisk, or an obelus, as suspicious; and in manuscripts still more modern is written without any mark; we see the various gradations by which it has acquired its place in our present text, and have proof positive that the verse was originally nothing more than a marginal

scholion, and of course spurious."* These remarks carry with them the clearness and evidence of demonstration; and would have gone far to have justified the total omission of the passage, had the Editors of the I. V. felt disposed to reject it as spurious. But they have communicated their suspicions in a manner, perhaps, sufficiently expressive, by printing it in a character different from the rest of the Text; and, if we quarrel with them, it must not be for having adopted this method of signifying their doubts, but for having neglected to mark the various shades of distinction in passages which are more or less doubtful. This defect, however, may be remedied in subsequent editions, by employing symbols expressive of the different degrees of probability to mark their approval or disapproval of particular passages.

We come now to the story of the Woman taken in Adultery, John vii. 53—viii. 11., another of those passages which the Editors of the I. V. have printed in the Italic character. The manuscript authority for and against the paragraph containing this story is almost equally divided; but the combined evidence of Manuscripts, Ver-

* Mich. Introd. Vol. ii. Part ii. p. 732.

sions and Fathers certainly appears to authorize its rejection. Hence, though it is not omitted by the Editors of the I. V., it is printed in a character which denotes that it is of doubtful authority; and "though not removed out of the Text by Griesbach, it is marked by him as very probably spurious." It is found in the Cambridge, Harleian and four other Uncial MSS; but is omitted, on the other hand, in the Alexandrine, the Vatican, the Ephrem and two others. It is likewise found in many small letter MSS, and omitted in many; though several in which it is inserted contain only from vs. 3 to 11. In upwards of thirty MSS. it is marked with an asterisk or obelus. In three it is appended to Luke xxi. In one it is placed after John vii. 36.; and in another between viii. 12 and 13. The author of the *Synopsis Scripturæ Sacræ* mentions it as doubtful, and places it after John viii. 20. In the Vatican MS. of the Persian it forms a part of John x.; and in seven or eight Greek MSS. it is placed at the end of John's Gospel. It would therefore seem probable, from the variety of forms and positions in which it occurs, that it has been gradually introduced into the Text of the N. T.; but when and by whom we have no possible means of ascertaining. The author, however, of an elaborate treatise entitled

" An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, &c." thinks otherwise; and has insinuated that this passage was cancelled by Eusebius in an Edition of the Greek Scriptures published by him under the sanction of Constantine the Great. But it does not appear from the Emperor's letter of instruction upon this occasion, that Eusebius was invested with power to remove a single syllable from the Edition then in common use. Nor can I find that such a power is hinted at by any writer, either ancient or modern, except Mr. Nolan, the author of the aforesaid " Inquiry." The words of Constantine are these. " It seemeth good unto us to submit to your consideration, that you would order to be written, on parchment prepared for the purpose, by able scribes, and accurately skilled in their art, fifty codices, both legible and portable, so as to be useful; namely, of *the Sacred Scriptures*, whereof chiefly you know the preparation and use to be necessary to the doctrine of the church:" *or*, " the preparation and use of which you know to be particularly necessary for the instruction of the church."* Now, you will please to observe that " *the Sacred Scriptures*," of which copies were to be prepared by order of Eusebius, are mentioned *with-*

* Euseb. Vit. Const. Lib. iv. Cap. xxxvi.

out exception or reserve in the above passage; and that he is invested with no "discretionary power," as the author of the "Inquiry" insinuates,* "of selecting chiefly *those sacred scriptures* which he knew to be useful and necessary to the doctrine of the church." The truth is that Eusebius had no further concern with these copies than the mere ordering of them; for it is added that "letters were also dispatched to the Receiver-General of the Province, commanding him to provide all things necessary for the preparation of the said copies;' and stating that it was the part of Eusebius only to see "that the will of the Emperor was *speedily* executed." How then can Mr. Nolan, venture to assert in such unequivocal terms† that this passage "was withdrawn by Eusebius in conformity to the powers with which he was vested by Constantine?" Is it possible that such an open violation of the Sacred Text could have remained undiscovered, or that the author of it could have escaped with impunity? Why did not the Trinitarian party expose such daring and unwarrantable conduct? Why did not the whole Christian world unite in branding it with the language of reprobation and abhorrence? The answer to these questions is obvious.

---

* p. 26. † p. 38.

No one ever thought of laying such a charge to the account of this eminent Father, till Mr. Nolan dragged it from the concealment in which it had peaceably slumbered nearly fifteen hundred years. To him belongs the sole merit of this important discovery; and pray let him enjoy the full advantages of it.—But, as I have had occasion to advert to this gentleman's book, I may perhaps be excused if I pursue the subject a little further than was originally intended.

A trembling anxiety for the fate of orthodoxy has, I fear, been either the avowed or concealed motive of all who have attacked Griesbach's Critical reputation. Mortified to think that this eminent critic has put so powerful a weapon into the hands of his adversaries, yet compelled to pay an involuntary homage to his profound skill and rigid impartiality, the friends of Trinitarianism have laboured to detect some fallacy in his system, and exerted their utmost efforts to invalidate the force of his conclusions. Among these friends Mr. Nolan holds a conspicuous rank; and, to the diligence and zeal manifested by him in defence of the cause which he has espoused, every person interested in the progress of Scriptural knowledge would doubtless have borne his cheerful and willing testimony, had his

labours and inquiries been directed to some better purpose. As it is, the event only serves to shew how little truth can be a gainer from the most laborious application and the greatest critical ingenuity, where the mind is previously influenced by an undue attachment to system. It was not, as appears from his own confession, because this writer sought truth for its own sake, that he became the impugner of Griesbach's system; but because the corrections of that eminent and laborious Editor had extended to proscribing three important texts,* (Acts xx. 28. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 John v. 7.) in the fate of which some of the leading doctrines of THE UNITED CHURCH became necessarily implicated. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.* Here lay the grievance; and hence we may trace the origin of that long and complicated train of sophisms and misrepresentations, which it has cost his readers so many tedious hours to unravel.

The system of Mr. Nolan pretty much resembles in its outward structure that of Griesbach; although they possess scarcely any other feature in common. The Byzantine, Western, and Alexandrine Recensions of the one, correspond in some measure with the Byzantine, Egyptian and Palestine of the other. The first of these, according

* Inquiry &c. p. 6.

to Mr. N., was revised by Lucianus; and is found in the Harleian (H.) and Moscow (Mt. V.) manuscripts, and the codex brixiensis, or Brescian manuscript of the old Italic. The second, or Egyptian, was revised by Hesychius, and imported by Eusebius of Verceli into the West.* It is found in the Cambridge manuscript, (D.) and the codex vercellensis, or Verceli manuscript of the old Italic. The third, or Palestine Recension, was *revised by Eusebius of Cæsarea,* and republished by Euthalius at Alexandria. It is found in the Vatican manuscript, (B.) the Latin Vulgate, and the writings of Eusebius and Jerome. Now, it is not a little extraordinary that the story of the Woman taken in Adultery is wanting in the Brescian and Verceli MSS. of the old Italic, which are the most ancient authorities alleged in favour of the Byzantine and Egyptian Recensions. It is likewise highly unfavourable to the position of Mr. N., that the evidence of these manuscripts is corroborated by that of Tertullian and Cyprian, the most eminent and valuable among the Latin Fathers; who, though their quotations do not uniformly agree with the old Italic Version, are nevertheless entitled to our particular regard on

* The version of Eusebius appears to have been made *before* his exile into the Thebaïs, so that he could not have brought it back with him thence into the West.

the ground of their high antiquity. The former of these wrote a book "*De virginibus velandis*;" and the latter another "*De habitu virginum*:" but in neither of these treatises do we find the most distant allusion to the story of the Adulteress. Cyprian, indeed, had a fair opportunity of quoting from it in the second section of his treatise, and would have found it much better adapted to his purpose than the citation which he has there made; yet no traces appear of his acquaintance with it. "Those words of our blessed Lord to the impotent man in the Gospel," says he, "plainly spoke his desire to save and teach, to cure and to admonish together: 'Behold thou art made whole; *sin no more*, lest a worse thing come unto thee.'" John v. 14.—The concluding address of our Lord to the Adulterous Woman, "*Go, and sin no more*," (John viii. 11.,) would undoubtedly have been far more appropriate to the subject, and infinitely more suitable to the observation which follows, than the above allusion to the story of the Impotent Man. "He labours to tincture the man's whole life and conversation with the fear of God, and prescribes to him the law of obedience at the same time whereat he restores his health; so that he is far from indulging a lawless liberty, but quite on the contrary, he lays the man under new and fresh

obligations from the circumstance of his cure; it being indeed less criminal to offend against the restraints of religion, before you are acquainted with it; as the guilt is infinitely less pardonable which is contracted after your knowledge of God and his blessed will."* The main stress of the above passage lies upon the words "*sin no more;*" and, if we consider the subject upon which the writer is treating, a reference to the story of the Adulteress will appear to have been almost unavoidable. Its absence, therefore, may be regarded as a conclusive testimony that Cyprian, who has quoted from every chapter in John's Gospel, and who has no less than eight references to the latter part of the chapter containing this story, was either totally ignorant of its existence, or rejected it as an interpolation.

Having thus shewn that the testimony of the early Latin Versions and Fathers contradicts our author's theory, I proceed to notice that of Origen: and if any thing were still wanting to vindicate Eusebius from the charge of having rejected the passage under consideration from the Text of the N. T., this, I feel convinced, would be amply sufficient to exculpate him. It is clear that

* The Genuine Works of Cyprian, done into English from the Oxford Edition, By Nath. Marshall, LL. B. London 1717. p. 83.

Origen, who died several years before Eusebius was born, had no knowledge of this story;* and, as Eusebius was his devoted follower and professed advocate, it is reasonable to conclude that his copies differed not materially from those of his master. It is, indeed, one of Mr. Nolan's avowed objects to prove that the Christians of "Palestine adopted the Text of Origen."† This eminent Father, who, notwithstanding his peculiarities, was the ornament and glory of the age in which he lived, quitted Alexandria about the year 231, and came to reside in Palestine; where, with a few short intervals, he appears to have spent the last twenty-five years of his life. Here he retained that high reputation as a Biblical scholar, which he had previously acquired in Egypt, his native country. Learned Christians from all parts flocked to hear his instructions,‡ and were proud to be reckoned among the number of his pupils: and, such was the opinion entertained of him by Theoctistus Bishop of Cæsarea, and Alexander Bishop of Jerusalem, that "they listened to him at all times as if he had been their master, and permitted him alone to expound the Scriptures, and perform other things relating to the instruction of the Church."‖

* Griesb. N. T. in loc.—Symb. Crit. Tom. ii. p. 427. † Inquiry &c. p. 11. ‡ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 33. ‖ Ibid. c. 27.

Whether he carried with him out of Egypt a copy of the Scriptures to which he had been there accustomed, or adopted the Text already established in Palestine, are questions of little importance to our present inquiry.* In either case it is morally certain that his copies did not contain the story of the Adulterous Woman; and, consequently, that Eusebius is unjustly charged with having removed it from the Text of Scripture.

To confirm the testimonies which have now been adduced, we have the authority of the old

* Mr. Nolan contends that there is an indecision in Origen's testimony; and says that "it is with little appearance of justice that his authority can be claimed in favour of the Alexandrian text." (p. 11.) But the following circumstances appear to me to authorize the contrary opinion. 1. Origen was born at Alexandria, and was appointed to preside over the catechetical school of that city at the age of eighteen. (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. c. 2. 3.) All his early associations would, therefore, naturally impel him to adopt that Text. 2. He did not finally quit Alexandria till he had arrived at the age of forty-five: consequently, his early associations were confirmed by the judgment of his maturer years. 3. He was the pupil of Clemens Alexandrinus, (Euseb. H. E. Lib. vi. c. 6.) to whose quotations his own bear a very close affinity. 4. Although he left Alexandria abruptly, (Inquiry &c. p. 364.) it does not appear that he was prevented from taking his library with him into Palestine; and even if he had been so prevented, the death of Demetrius, which happened almost immediately afterwards, would have given him an opportunity of recovering possession of it. "In the very same year, as is supposed, *Demetrius* died; who was succeeded by *Heraclas*, and he by *Dionysius* in the catechetical school; who was also one of *Origen's* scholars, and succeeded *Heraclas* in the Bishoprick of *Alexandria*. Which, as *Tillemont* argues, may afford reason to conclude, that the animosity against *Origen* abated after the death of *Demetrius*." (Lardner's Credib. Pt. 2. Vol. 3. p. 196.)

Syriac Version, which omits the passage in question, and for the first part of which Mr. Nolan claims* an antiquity not less remote than the third century. We have already seen, in our inquiries relating to the Canon of the N. T. (p. 49.), that this Version was made at an early period of the Christian era; and was probably completed about the third century. Inferring, then, with Mr. N., from the absence of Eusebius's Sections, that the Gospels were translated before those Sections came into use among the Christians of Palestine;† we are naturally led to the conclusion that the story of the Adulteress was omitted in the Syriac Version, not on the authority of Eusebius, but because it was wanting in the Greek copies of the translator. Hence, then, it appears evident that Eusebius is unjustly charged with having cancelled the passage under consideration, or with having contributed in any degree towards its removal from the Text of the N. T.: to which I shall now add that it may even be doubted whether he had any knowledge of the existence of such a passage. He speaks, indeed, of a story which Papias "had mentioned," about a woman who was accused of many crimes before the Lord;" and adds that "this relation

---

* p. 405. † p. 404.

is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews."* But this is no proof that the story of the Adulteress, as related in John's Gospel, was known either to Eusebius or Papias. The identity of the two narratives yet remains to be proved; and I see no reason why the story mentioned by Papias may not have been any other as well as this. A similar mistake has arisen with regard to the testimony of Chrysostom; who is said by Griesbach† to have made no allusion to the story of the Woman taken in Adultery, and by our author‡ to have acknowledged it in express terms. But the truth is this. There is an allusion to some story of the kind in Chrysostom's sixtieth Homily; but, according to Mill,‖ who refers us to Cotelerius for the correctness of his statement, the reference is to Luke vii. 47. "Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little." It appears, then, that the above allusion to Papias affords no evidence as to the genuineness of the passage in question; and that Grotius and Hammond,§ who suppose that he learnt it from the scholars and hearers of John, and that it was received as

* Hist. Eccles. Lib. iii. c. 39. † In loc. ‡ Inquiry &c. p. 37.

‖ "Nec enim historiam cujus meminit hom. 60. in *Joan.* hujus mulieris esse, sed alterius apud *Luc.* 7. 47. recte monet Cl. Cotelerius." Millii N. T. Tom. 1. p. 267. § In loc.

genuine by the early Christians on his authority, had no proper foundation for such an opinion. What the story mentioned by Papias might be in detail, it is impossible at this distance of time to decide; but that it was in substance different from that which is now found in John's Gospel every candid and impartial person must acknowledge. Papias expressly says that the woman to whom he alludes was "accused of *many* crimes," and does not specify that of Adultery in particular; whereas, in the other case, the charge is solely confined to the crime of Adultery, (John viii. 3. 4.) with a view, as we are told, (vs. 6.) to criminate our Lord by the answer which he gave as to the propriety or legality of stoning persons detected under such circumstances.

But I hasten to the consideration of 2 Pet. ii, the last passage with which I shall trouble you. The style of the first and third chapters of this Epistle is said to bear a considerable resemblance to that of the former; but the case is widely different with regard to the second chapter. This circumstance, then, presents a fair and legitimate ground of suspicion as to its genuineness: but it must be obvious to every one that the suspicion is very different from that which prevails respecting the story of the Adulteress; and ought

therefore to be conveyed to the mind of the reader in a shape less imposing. On this account I cannot help repeating the hope already expressed, (p. 112.) that, in subsequent Editions of the I. V., this oversight may be repaired. Of the willingness of the Editors to listen to any friendly suggestion by which their Version may be still further amended, they have given ample proofs in the editions through which it has already passed. When they engaged in the performance of their arduous task, they were far from thinking that their labours would meet with universal assent. On the contrary, they anticipated much discussion from the publication of their work; and, aware that it was still "susceptible of far greater improvement" even after it had received the last polish from their hands, they gave it to the world merely as an *Improved Version* of a *Corrected Text*. Agreeably to this profession they have since availed themselves of the remarks which have been made upon it both by friends and enemies; and I have no hesitation in saying that their Version, in its present state, though still far short of absolute perfection, greatly surpasses in excellence all other Versions hitherto published. Their contemporaries, indeed, may not be disposed to acknowledge the full extent of the services which they have conferred on

Sacred Criticism; but let us hope that posterity will atone for this neglect by enrolling them amongst the most enlightened and successful advocates of genuine Christian Truth.

I have now, my dear Friend, done all in my power to make you acquainted with the Scriptural grounds of Unitarianism: I have collected and arranged the testimony of the early Christian Church with a view to ascertain the true Canon of the New Testament: I have also examined with care and impartiality the grounds of difference between the Received Text and the Improved Version; and shall be amply repaid if I have succeeded in throwing light upon any of these subjects, or in removing from your mind any difficulties with which it may have been embarrassed. The opinions, indeed, which it has been my object to vindicate, are not the opinions of the majority: but, it is a satisfaction to reflect that they are the opinions of individuals, who are no less distinguished for soundness of learning and acuteness of intellect, than for purity of heart and integrity of life. It would give me great additional pleasure to see *you* among their number; but I have no wish that you should abandon your present sentiments at the expense of one moment's comfort, or with the breach of one friendly tie. On

taking leave, however, I would recommend you to adopt, both in this and every other investigation upon which you enter, the noble advice of Father Simon,—

Alterius ne sit qui suus esse potest!

And if, in pursuance of this maxim, you discover one passage in your Bible which bears the character of spuriousness: if you find a gloss or an interpretation which speaks a language dishonourable to the Almighty: if you detect a syllable or a letter for which no proper authority can be alleged:—reject it, I entreat you, with an honest indignation: blot it from the genuine records of your Christian Faith: and suffer it not to defile those pages which ought to be peculiarly dedicated to the God of truth and holiness. With every kind wish, believe me

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

ROBERT WALLACE.

Chesterfield,
Oct. 25, 1819.

T. Woodhead, Printer, New Square, Chesterfield.

GTU Library
3 2400 00392 3376